# JAROSLAV HAŠEK: A REBEL OR A REVOLUTIONARY?

A thesis

submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and

Research in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Jana Marie Bubenik

Department of Russian and Slavic Studies

McGill University

JAROSLAV HAŠEK: A REBEL OR A REVOLUTIONARY ?

by Jana Marie Bubenik

A thesis submitted for the

degree of Master of Arts


ABSTRACT

This study investigates two different points of view of literary criticism on the Czech satirist and author of The Good Soldier Švejk and his Fortunes in the World War, Jaroslav Hašek. On the one hand, he is perceived as a progressive artist with revolutionary ideas well before World War I, who therefore logically embraced the revolutionary program of the Bolsheviks after the October Revolution and rendered important services to their cause in Soviet Russia. According to this point of view, Hašek remained a revolutionary writer until his death in Czechoslovakia several years later. On the other hand, Hašek is judged as a prewar bohemian rebel against the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy who, after having experienced the Civil War in Russia and having supported the Soviet regime, returned to Czechoslovakia and reverted to his bohemian image, although a firm ideological stand would have seemed more appropriate for a former Red Army commissar.

This study examines whether Hašek was a revolutionary or a rebel during his short but turbulent life. The investigation is based upon Hašek's literary work, his biography, and the available critical material from Czech, Soviet, and English sources.

JAROSLAV HAŠEK: UN REBELLE OU UN REVOLUTIONNAIRE ?

par Jana Marie Bubenik

Thèse soumise en vue de l'obtention

d'une Maîtrise ès Arts

RESUMÉ

Cette étude recherche deux points-de-vue différents de la critique littéraire du satiriste et auteur tchèque du Brave soldat Chveik et ses fortunes pendant la première guerre mondiale, Jaroslav Hašek. D'une part, il est considéré comme un artist progressiste avec les idées révolutionnaires bien avant la première guerre mondiale, qui a ainsi logiquement embrassé le programme révolutionnaire des bolchéviques après la révolution d'octobre et a rendu d'importants services pour leur cause en Russie soviétique. Selon ce point-de-vue, Hašek est resté un auteur révolutionnaire jusqu'à sa mort en Tchécoslovaquie quelques années plus tard. D'autre part, Hašek est jugé en tant qu'un rebelle bohème contre l'établissement de la monarchie austro-hongroise qui est revenu en Tchécoslovaquie après l'expérience de la guerre civile en Russie quand il a soutenu le régime soviétique. Malgré tout, Hašek est redevenu l'homme bohème, même si l'attitude idéologique ferme d'un ex-commissaire de l'Armée Rouge lui serait plus propre.

Cette étude examine si Hašek était un révolutionnaire

ou un rebelle pendant sa vie courte mais perturbée. Cette investigation se base sur l'oeuvre littéraire de Hašek, sa biographie et le matériel critique de sources tchèques, soviétiques et anglaises.

Département d'Etudes russes et slaves
Université McGill
Août 1985

The system of transliteration applied throughout this thesis is System III, which is used by The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies and by The Slavic and East European Journal. Within the English text, I have retained the traditional spelling of well-known names only; otherwise, the names of Soviet and Czech literary publications, publishing houses, and people appear in their transliterated form.

Since the Czech alphabet is almost analogous to System III, I use it as such in the thesis, although there are some exceptions which, in fact, contradict the rules of application: a) the symbol ch is pronounced kh in Czech; b) the symbol x is equivalent to the same symbol in English; and c) the symbol e is pronounced hard. Thus the Russian name Eroximov, for example, would appear in the Czech text as Jerochymov.

Unless otherwise indicated, the quotations from Hašek's works or from other Czech authors were translated by the author of the present thesis.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Professors Irene Pavilanis and Alexander Fodor for their guidance and assistance throughout the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A real literature can be created only by madmen, hermits, heretics, dreamers, rebels, and sceptics, not by diligent and trustworthy functionaries.

E. Zamyatin

# PREFACE

Jaroslav Hašek was always a controversial figure in Czech literature. In the early stages of Hašek's literary career, the polemics were kept on the level of literary criticism. Although Hašek established himself as a popular satirist and humorist during his lifetime, his anti-intellectual stance and his irreverence toward the literary profession caused contemporary critics to consider him a frivolous writer. However, the circumstances changed radically when Hašek, at the end of his life, published his only novel about Švejk.[1] From that time onwards the controversy became a political issue.

Despite the fact that Hašek's book was well received among Czech readers, it was the immense popularity of his novel abroad which forced Czech official and literary circles to pass judgement on Švejk. Czech nationalists perceived Švejk as a negative reflection of the Czech national character, while the left-wing critics defended the novel. The nationalist poet Viktor Dyk attacked Švejk in Národní listy (April 1928) for its nihilistic spirit and its negative influence on Czech society, especially on the army. President Masaryk rejected švejkovina (Švejk-like behaviour) as a form of escapism from social responsibilities. The Communist writer Julius Fučík, on the contrary, saw Švejk in

favourable light, for, apart from its literary value, he viewed its influence on bourgeois society and the army as a positive one. Thus, political polarization occurring in the Czech intellectual community prevented an objective literary analysis of Hašek's work.

The German occupation interrupted the polemics about Švejk, and the book was banned as a subversive work. The horrifying experience of World War II initiated a new appraisal of Hašek's work among the critics, but this process was terminated by the Communist take-over in February 1948. From then on, in Czechoslovakia Hašek was judged purely from the Marxist point of view. There was, however, a period of "critical vacillation" towards him: once the Communists shifted from opposition to governing party, švejkovina became a subject of official concern as it had been during the "bourgeois" republic. It is now the official point of view that Švejk, as a character, is not justified in either socialist society or the socialist army. He is to be judged only in his historical role, as ridiculing fossilized Austria-Hungary, the imperial army, and the imperialist war.

In spite of early objections, official recognition did come. In the early 1950's Hašek's stories appeared in book form, but were carefully selected in order to show Hašek's class consciousness. Hašek was described as "an uncompromising critic of the decaying bourgeois regime" and "an active fighter for the new order," while "Švejk became an

ingenious satire on the imperialist wars, due to the influence of the slogans of the Great October Revolution."[2] After 1956, the publications of Hašek's work multiplied and his ideological background was not questioned further. In 1957 Jaroslav Křížek published a detailed study of Hašek's sojourn in Russia, in which the affinity of Hašek's Marxist convictions, the October Revolution, and Švejk is affirmed.[3]

Today, in his homeland, Hašek is acknowledged as its best and most successful satirist and is rightly placed among the most distinguished modern European writers. His writings are assiduously studied, collected, frequently published, and analyzed. Recently, Hašek's 100th birthday was celebrated and an international symposium on Hašek took place in April 1983.

There are also numerous Soviet studies on Hašek which deal primarily with his revolutionary past and emphasize his contribution as a journalist and propagandist. A more analytical work, which appeared in the sixties, is S. Vostokova'a critical biographical study. Her conclusion about Hašek is typical of Soviet scholarship: she sees Hašek's contribution to literature in the creation of a new hero (Švejk), "man-the-victor," as opposed to "man-the victim" or "the rebel-individualist" so popular in West European works. In her view, Švejk does represent the national character, and it is to Hašek's credit that he succeeded in depicting it. In addition, she stresses Hašek's optimistic perception of life and categorizes him as a pro-

letarian writer "who stood at the beginnings of socialist realism."[4]

I. A. Bernštejn's more recent work on the 20th century Czech novel encompasses new elements in the literary discussion. Hašek is compared to such contemporaries as Kafka, Musil, and Kraus and is discussed in terms of dadaism and the literature of the absurd. But here, too, the emphasis is on Hašek's unshakeable optimism.[5]

The insistence, on the part of Soviet critics, on Hašek's optimism constitutes a serious limitation to literary discussion. Of course, this attitude reflects their adherence to Marxist criteria of good literature, namely, that the work be positive and optimistic. However, there are critics who expressed a different opinion. The most prominent Czech critic of the inter-war period, František Xaver Šalda, detected "dissonance" in the novel and considered it, "despite its comicality, a book sad to death."[6]

Similarly, there is a disagreement among literary critics (along ideological lines) in their evaluation of Hašek's work which was created during his lifetime. Although Hašek is best known for his novel Švejk, it is really some twelve hundred short stories and articles which represent the major part of his work. He wrote many of them during the first period of his life before the First World War (1901-1914), during the war in Russia and throughout the Civil War when he joined the Bolsheviks (1916-1920), and after his return to Czechoslovakia (1920-1923).

While Western critics perceive Hašek primarily as a rebel against all authority,[7] the Soviet literary scholar N. P. Elanskij concludes that Hašek had already created a revolutionary aesthetic ideal before the First World War; that he was a socialist and observed the world from this position.[8] Elanskij sees Hašek as a revolutionary who scorned the bourgeois system, championed the working class and rejected political life because the bourgeois parties had no satisfactory answers to the social problems of the day.[9]

While staying in Russia during the war, Hašek supported the idea of a free Czechoslovakia (until then a part of Austria-Hungary) and helped to organize the Czechoslovak Legion from Czech and Slovak prisoners of war. After the October Revolution, he joined the Bolsheviks--a decision judged rebellious and treasonable by Czech nationalists, but praised by Marxist critics. In their view, Hašek remained faithful to his revolutionary ideals until his death.[10] However, his writings published after his return to Czechoslovakia are not as clear-cut.

This pattern--whether Hašek's image was that of a revolutionary or that of a rebel--repeats itself from the beginning to the end of his literary career and this thesis will investigate the double image of Hašek throughout his literary works in an attempt to clarify it.

The Introduction of this thesis relates Hašek's bio-

graphy to the historical events and cultural influences during the period 1880-1930. Chapter I focuses on Hašek's pre-war stories and feuilletons, written in the social context of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and influenced, on the one hand, by his extensive travelling, and on the other, by his anarchism. In addition, his social and political satire will be discussed. Chapter II deals with Hašek's political and literary activities as a war journalist in Russia during the First World War, first in the Czechoslovak Legion, and later in the Red Army. In the last chapter, Hašek's writings after his return to Czechoslovakia are analyzed.

## FOOTNOTES TO PREFACE

[1]Jaroslav Hašek, Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války, 4 vols., written between 1920 and 1923. The novel has been translated into a number of languages; it has also been filmed and dramatized several times: the best known dramatization is by Bertolt Brecht. The first translation into English, by Paul Selver, appeared in 1930. A new translation, by Cecil Parrott, was published under the title The Good Soldier Švejk and His Fortunes in the World War (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1973). Subsequently, Hašek's novel is referred to as Švejk.

[2]Zdena Ančík, "Nová podobizna Jaroslava Haška," a Foreward to Malá zoologická zahrada by Jaroslav Hašek, ed. Zdena Ančík (Prague: 1950), pp. 5-7.

[3]Jaroslav Křížek, Jaroslav Hašek v revolučním Rusku (Prague: 1957), p. 9.

[4]S. Vostokova, Jaroslav Gašek (Moscow: 1964), pp. 178-81.

[5]I. A. Bernštejn, Češskij roman XX. veka i puti realizma v evropejskix literaturax (Moscow: 1979), pp. 87, 104-10.

[6]František Xaver Šalda, "Jaroslav Durych, essayista," Šaldův zápisník, 1 (Prague: Otto Girgal, 1928-29), pp. 16-17. F. X. Šalda's judgement was not affected by ideological trends. Although he realized the importance of Hašek's novel in Czech literature, he did not glorify the book as the Communist writers did. On the other hand, Šalda refused to accept accusations of the well-known Catholic writer Jaroslav Durych who suggested that Švejk was a reflection of Czech intellectuality, morality, and character.

[7]Robert Pynsent, ed., Introduction to Czech Prose and Verse (London: Athlone Press, 1979), p. lviii; Cecil Parrott, Preface to The Red Commissar: Including Further Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk and Other Stories by Jaroslav Hašek, ed., trans. Cecil Parrott (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1981), pp. xiii-xiv.

[8]N. P. Elanskij, Jaroslav Gašek (Moscow: 1980), p. 29.

[9]Ibid., pp. 12, 13, 16.

[10]Ibid., p. 44; Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, p. 312.

# INTRODUCTION

Jaroslav Hašek was born in Prague on 30 April 1883, a year also marked by the death of Karl Marx and the birth of another Prague writer--Franz Kafka. Although at this time Europe enjoyed a period of relative peace, the atmosphere of the multi-national Habsburg Empire was far from peaceful. This state of affairs was due to emergent waves of nationalism, which proved to be a centrifugal force leading several decades later to the dissolution of the monarchy. The Czech population felt especially dissatisfied with the government in Vienna because the German-speaking minority in the Czech lands successfully blocked any progress which would have resulted in the improvement of the Czech position in the monarchy.

The compromise of 1867, which established Austria as a dual monarchy Austria-Hungary, was vigorously opposed by the Czechs, whose political program was based on federalism. The compromise sparked a new wave of much less tolerant nationalism. In spite of the fact that they were a majority in their country, the Czechs were unfairly represented as a minority group in the regional parliaments because the voting privileges depended on individual income. The German-speaking aristocracy and well-to-do bourgeoisie occupied the influential positions at the local level. The same can be

said about the Imperial Parliament in Vienna where the Slav majority of the empire was, in fact, in the minority. The situation inevitably led to the radicalization of the Czech and other Slav populations.

However, the nationalist strife of the last decades of the nineteenth century obscured the crux of the problem. In essence, the real issue was the rapid industrialization of the Czech lands and the subsequent social changes in the society, which shifted gradually from a feudal system towards capitalism. By 1900, over half the population of Bohemia was connected with industry, a number far too high to be ignored in a society still monarchistic in structure. In effect, the Czechs experienced, so to speak, a bloodless, slow-motion French Revolution, venting their frustration over nationalist problems.

During Prime Minister Eduard Taafee's era, the Czechs obtained several concessions. In the early eighties, the University of Prague, until then German, was divided into two institutions, one Czech and one German. The local administration also was required to use both languages rather than only German, as was done previously. The most important change was the improved franchise ratio, which enabled the Czechs to better their position in the regional representative institutions, although not in the Imperial Parliament in Vienna. From then on, the Czechs worked towards the attainment of autonomy, while realizing that as long as the Germans and Hungarians preferred the dual sys-

tem, they would never achieve their goal. The unsettled nationalist problems and the nature of Austrian external policies in favour of a Triple Alliance with Germany--a move never popular among the Czechs--sealed the fate of the monarchy which, in 1914, hurled its population into war.

Hašek spent his childhood and adolescence in these turbulent times. His parents were originally from southern Bohemia but settled in the capital after Josef Hašek found a job as a teacher in a private German school. Although he was considered a bright student, Hašek was unable to conform to the discipline of the contemporary educational system. Later, his dislike for school intensified to the point of profound disdain for any kind of academic institution. Hašek's anti-clerical feelings developed along similar lines. Catechism was an important part of the school curriculum, but Hašek did not prove to be a brilliant student in this particular subject. Although his parents were devout Catholics and he himself often served as an altar boy, his disrespect for the official religion later turned into a violent hatred for the organized church and for religion <u>per se</u>.

The death of Josef Hašek in 1896 left his wife in a difficult financial situation and his two sons, Jaroslav and the younger Bohuslav, without stable parental influence at very precarious ages. At this time, Prague became the center of frequent street riots due to the resignation of Prime Minister Badeni's Cabinet. Badeni proposed to give

equal status to the Czech and German languages, but his proposal caused demonstrations in the German population.[1] In Prague, the Czechs answered with their own demonstrations. Hašek's participation in the riots resulted in his expulsion from school.

The hot-headed teenager worked in a pharmacy, only to be asked to leave shortly thereafter because of his undesirable inventiveness and practical jokes. Nevertheless, Hašek was admitted to the Commercial Academy, a school which employed some of the best contemporary scholars. One of them, the lexicographer Václav A. Jung, after reading Hašek's first literary attempts, recognized Hašek's talent, seeing in him a future Czech Mark Twain. After graduating from school in 1902, Hašek worked in the Insurance Bank of Slavie.

A trip to Slovakia in the summer of 1900 proved to be a turning point in Hašek's life on two accounts. On the one hand, it resulted in his early story, Gypsies at Their Feast (Cikáni o hodech), published in the prominent Prague newspaper Národní listy[2] in January 1901. On the other hand, he also acquired at that time a taste for vagrancy which was never to leave him. This side of Hašek's character puzzled his friends and was a constant source of worry for his family. And indeed, Hašek was dismissed from a job after two spontaneous visits to Slovakia; it was then that he decided to live off his literary work only. The failure of his first book of poems, Májové výkřiky (1903) did not deter him from writing, and his short stories--often based on per-

sonal experience gained while roaming across Hungary, Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, and later Switzerland and southern Germany--were successful.

Back from his wanderings, Hašek joined the anarchist movement in 1904 and wrote articles for radical journals. To his unrestrained character, contemptuous of any authority but always ready for action, anarchism was the most congenial doctrine. But he did not join the intellectual circle of anarcho-Communists led by the poet Stanislav K. Neumann;[3] rather, he associated himself with the anarcho-syndicalists, a group operating mainly among workers in northern Bohemia. Hašek left Prague in order to organize meetings and lectures in the Most region and to edit the anarchist newspaper. He soon became disappointed with the inner politics of the organization and left, although he remained in contact with the anarchists in Prague until 1910. Hašek's anarchist sympathies also led to frequent conflicts with the authorities; he kept Prague's police busy with his indefatigable participation in various demonstrations.

Although Hašek enjoyed his lifestyle, it proved to be the main obstacle to his marriage plans because the parents of Jarmila Mayerová did not consider him a desirable son-in-law. The young couple's relationship had to survive many difficulties for several years before they were finally married in 1910. In order to marry Jarmila, Hašek promised to change: he severed contacts with the anarchists, re-entered the church, and secured a steady job as an editor at

Svět zvířat (Animal world), a respectable natural history journal.

It did not take long for Hašek to come to the conclusion that the respectable journal needed some form of improvement. In his inimitable style he fabricated stories about non-existent animals, one of which appeared in a foreign journal. His hoax was discovered and Hašek was fired. Once again he became a freelance writer. This meant an insecure financial base and it led to marital problems. Although there is evidence that he could have lived quite comfortably off his royalties had he tried earnestly to do so, he was constantly in debt. His wife's attempts to reform him, to cure him of his drinking habits, and to diminish the influence of his bohemian friends were all in vain and ended in bitter disputes. Hašek's conflict, which resulted in his inability to acquiesce to Jarmila's demands, was due to the fact that his otherwise self-destructive night life was simultaneously the source of his artistic inspiration. It was this vicious circle which resulted in his deep depression and an attempt to jump off the Charles bridge in February 1911.[4]

His personal problems notwithstanding, the year 1911 was one of Hašek's most prolific, and among the stories published that year was the first version of Švejk. In addition, Hašek achieved great popularity by organizing a new "political" party called "The Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law." It was a highly successful travesty of the contemporary electoral system, which exposed to ridi-

cule not only the monarchy, but Czech politics as well.

During this period, Czech politicians reached an impasse, having no clear goals except for their reformist ideas or gradualist policies within the framework of the existing system of Austria-Hungary; that is, within "the limits of the law." As for Hašek, he had neither patience with nor respect for political parties, and any association he had with them always ended unpleasantly. In 1911, he secured a job as assistant editor of local news at České slovo (Czech Word), the daily of the National Socialist Party.[5] To report local incidents proved again to be tedious work for Hašek and an occasion for his never-dormant imagination to invent many a story. He went as far as selling his canards to other reporters for a beer. Soon afterwards Hašek lost his job for publicly sympathizing with workers against the back-room dealings of the National Socialist Party. Unable to support his wife and new-born son, Hašek left home. Although the Hašeks were separated for many years, they were never officially divorced.

Hašek's personal failures led to his gradual withdrawal from his former milieu. He felt more comfortable among social outcasts, vagabonds, and drunkards. His friends who tried to help him, and off whom he frequently sponged, were bitterly disappointed by his obvious ingratitude and rude behaviour. Despite a way of life detrimental to himself and to others, Hašek's literary talent did not diminish. He continued to write stories and entertaining cabaret plays

until the outbreak of the war.[6]

Hašek's bohemian life is a puzzle for all biographers who try to unravel the stories and anecdotes about him, because Hašek himself spread legends and rumours to increase his fame. To explain his behaviour, British literary critic and Hašek's biographer Cecil Parrott concludes that Hašek was "the classic example of a creative psychopath, who could not help himself."[7] In Parrott's view, without his abundant literary talent Hašek's fame would have been limited to police records. Alongside his irresponsibility, which was quite astounding even for a bohemian, Hašek's predominant characteristic was his spontaneity. His tendency to let his emotions rule over his reason frequently caused him to meet with bitter disillusionment. The alternation of boundless enthusiasm for action and subsequent gloomy disenchantment was a recurring pattern in his life. He would at first be genuinely interested, then deeply involved in a cause, but would soon be frustrated by human failures, and finally he would withdraw completely, only to satirize his own experiences.

His general unreliability was also the cause of Hašek's exclusion from the mainstream of serious literature. Traditionally, Czech writers were guardians of Czech national consciousness, and the Czech National Revival was undoubtedly achieved because of their indefatigable dedication, idealism, and unabated belief in the Czech nation. An unfortunate feature of their achievement was their uncritical attitude,

blurred by national sentiment, coupled with a willingness to sacrifice art for the sake of the political message. In the view of Robert Pynsent, British literary scholar, this predicament caused Czech literature to be "more introspective than English," and only a few writers were ever able "to make fun of themselves or Czech national characteristics."[8] As we will see, the iconoclastic Hašek did not spare anything or anybody in his satire.

Because of his contemptuous disposition, Hašek was "an outsider" to the professional community of literary artists. He ridiculed their over-intellectuality but was himself subjected to severe criticism for his readiness to sell stories piecemeal to any newspaper, thus degrading his literary vocation to the level of mere craft. Hašek's writing habits were indeed peculiar: he frequently wrote his stories in the noisiest of pubs, taverns, or cafés, and, without considering the quality of the piece, he had it published as soon as possible. Except for the clerical press, where the dislike was mutual, he cared little about the politics of the papers, contributing indiscriminately to both anarchist and well-established "bourgeois" publications.

In Hašek's defence, one should emphasize that he faced the perennial problem of the modern artist: to write either what he wanted or what the public wanted to read. Being a short story writer and a journalist, Hašek depended solely on his literary talent for income and thus on public taste. He therefore succeeded in reaching ordinary people, but not

intellectuals. It was especially the vulgar tone, evident in many of Hašek's stories, which did not appeal to some of his intellectual contemporaries such as Arne Novák or Karel Čapek. Probably the best judgement on this point comes from one of today's Czech writers, Josef Škvorecký, who compares Hašek with another modern surrealist artist, Bohumil Hrabal:

> Hašek, however, was a cruel, harsh, absolutely unlyrical storyteller; Hrabal is fundamentally a lyrical poet. . . .
> . . . He also has Hašek's wonderful ear for the spoken language, and a linguistic fantasy which helped him to create a very unique and personal narrative language. . . . Hrabal's peculiar strength is his ability to entertain the simplest reader and yet be admired by the most intellectual of the intellectuals. Which, to my mind, has always been one of the rare, infallible signs of greatness.[9]

Although Hašek was disliked by the intellectuals, he was popular among the ordinary readers throughout his pre-war literary career.

At the turn of the century Czech literature readily absorbed West European literary trends, such as symbolism or naturalism, and further cultivated critical realism, which still had many exponents among literary artists. Yet it was not only their literary affiliation which served to categorize writers, but their political credo as well. The period before the outbreak of the war was marked by fervent political and literary upheaval, with the anarchists as the most vocal group.

Hašek also joined--albeit temporarily, as was his custom--the Syrinx literary group where he met aspiring young artists

who later became prominent: Karel H. Hilar, future director of the National Theatre; satirical poet Josef Mach; playwright Jiří Mahen; Rudolf Těsnohlídek, librettist of Janáček's opera The Cunning Little Vixen. But Hašek was not inclined to participate in literary discussions about modern art or in philosophical debates. Avoiding abstract matters as much as possible, he associated himself rather with second-rate poets but first-rate drinking companions.

Two other influences ought to be pointed out: Prague itself and the cultural atmosphere of the entire Habsburg Empire. Prague, at the turn of the century, presented an interesting mixture of medievalism and modernism, and was described by the Czech scholar Emanuel Frynta as "'dadaistic' and 'surrealist' avant la lettre."[10]

The mixed population of Prague which was comprised of Bohemian Germans, Czechs, and German-speaking Jews, was also an interesting feature. For the Germans of the empire, including those living in the Czech lands, Vienna represented the acme of their political and cultural life; but for the Czechs, their "Golden Prague," however provincial, was their center. Yet the inspiration which Prague provided in abundance to many artists was not limited to any nationality: Hašek found many a subject for his stories in the streets of Prague; but Rilke, Kafka, and Werfel also expressed their affection for the city in their own tongue.

The Habsburg Empire, although politically in decline, was able to produce outstanding people in the fields of the

arts and humanities before 1918. From this point of view, Prague benefited from Austrian culture just as much as the monolithic German civilization was to be positively influenced by Slav culture.[11] Thus, while suffering politically, the Czechs enjoyed an artistic interchange on a multinational level which was stimulating for their creative elements.

But Hašek would not agree with this perspective. For him, the stifling social conventions, including the cultural achievements of the empire, represented only a heavy burden. Moreover, the decision of the Austrian government to subdue the Southern Slavs by military action, which led to World War I, only increased Hašek's contempt for the monarchy.

"And so they've killed our Ferdinand": thus began Hašek's novel Švejk; and so, too, began the world conflagration which interrupted Hašek's bohemian lifestyle, and disrupted as well the more orderly existence of society in general.

The Czechs were not enthusiastic when the war on Serbia was declared. Their sympathies were with Southern Slavs and Russians, but paradoxically, as Austrian citizens, they were required to fight alongside Germany, their historical enemy. Their only compelling reason for remaining in the monarchy was that their alliance with the Habsburgs represented a safeguard against the rapidly expanding Hohenzollern Empire. By its decision to enter the war the monarchy, at least in the eyes of the Czechs, lost its raison d'être. The dilemma of being an Austrian patriot and thus loyal to the emperor,

or a Czech patriot loyal to the nation, was in the end resolved in favour of the latter.

The struggle for an independent Czechoslovakia was led abroad by Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, who united the Czechs and Slovaks outside the monarchy and succeeded in organizing the Czechoslovak army from prisoners of war in Western Europe and in Russia. As the war dragged on, a steadily growing number of Czech soldiers found their way into the Allied armies. In France, they were soon organized into separate military units, but in Russia, where the majority of surrenders occurred, the prisoners of war were used primarily as a working force. Masaryk intended to persuade the Russian government to allow the formation of a Czech Legion willing to fight Germany.

Prior to the February Revolution, the Czechs were organized in a small military unit called Družina which was a part of the Russian army. Družina had been originally established by the Czech settlers in Russia in 1914 in order to prove their loyalty to the tsar. Since many of them retained their Austrian citizenship, they were afraid of being treated as potential enemies and thus facing internment and the confiscation of their property. Družina was entirely under Russian command and consisted mainly of the Czechs living in Russia.[12] The Czech prisoners of war were allowed to join only if they accepted Russian citizenship and embraced the Orthodox religion. These conditions prevented many from joining, a fact which the tsarist govern-

ment did not mind because it had no intention of stocking its army with unreliable former Austrian subjects who had betrayed, after all, their emperor. But after the February Revolution these conditions no longer applied and the Legion increased in numbers rapidly.

In order to persuade the Russian government to form the military units out of prisoners of war, the Czechoslovak National Council in Paris (led by Masaryk, Beneš and Štefánik) sent forth Deputy Dürich. Dürich, known for his tsarophile stand, was supported by the government of Nicholas II and the pro-tsarist faction of the Czechs living in Russia. His mission almost split the independent movement, because Masaryk advocated a political program based on a Western democratic model. In this he was supported by the Czech and Slovak immigrants in Western Europe and in the United States, whereas their countrymen who had settled in Russia were in favour of a union under the Romanovs. Because of its vital interest in the issue, the tsarist government secretly encouraged Dürich to replace Masaryk.

Dürich was also countenanced by the most influential Czech organization in Russia at that time, the Kiev League. The conservative and tsarophile Kiev League hoped to liberate the Czech nation from the Habsburgs and to give the crown of St. Wenceslas to the Romanovs. However, as the war progressed and more and more Czech soldiers found their way into the Russian prison camps, Russian army, and subsequently into the Czech settlers' organizations, the situa-

tion began to change. The views of the prisoners of war differed sharply from those of the tsarophile Czech settlers. They were anti-dynastic, which meant not only anti-Habsburg, but also anti-Romanov, and they wanted more democratic government than Russia could offer. This is the reason why they preferred the liberal and pro-Masaryk organization located in Petrograd. Consequently, the situation resulted in an impasse: Dŭrich had the support of the tsarist government and the Kiev League while Masaryk had the support of the prisoners of war who outnumbered the Czech settlers. This awkward predicament was solved unexpectedly by the February Revolution and by the abdication of Nicholas II. Thus the Kiev League lost its influence due to the change in the Russian government. The Petrograd group, which was supported by the majority of prisoners of war, became the representative body (Branch) of the National Council in Russia under the leadership of Masaryk, and this contributed toward a greater unification of the independence movement. Masaryk arrived in Russia in order to rectify the situation created by Dŭrich and to convince the new government of the importance of a Czech Legion and the urgency of its expansion. When, after some delays, Prime Minister Kerensky endorsed the formation of the Czechoslovak Legion, the dream of a free Czechoslovakia seemed more realistic.

Meanwhile, Hašek had been called up and sent to the Galician front in the summer of 1915. His career in the imperial army was short-lived but long enough for him to

gather material for his future novel Švejk. While in the Austrian army, Hašek was charged with violations of military discipline, yet this was counterbalanced by a nomination for bravery. However, he never received his silver medal for he was taken prisoner by the Russians in September of the same year. After he was captured, Hašek was sent with other prisoners of war to the camp in Tockoe, near Buzuluk, where he survived an extremely harsh winter and an epidemic of typhus.[13]

In the summer of 1916, Hašek joined Družina. His previous experience as a writer and, more importantly, as a journalist, was welcomed by the Kiev League. Hašek wrote for its newspaper Čechoslovan which was read by many Czech soldiers and prisoners of war who were stationed in the Ukraine. When a second version of Švejk called The Good Soldier Švejk in Captivity (Dobrý voják Švejk v zajetí) came out in 1917, Hašek's popularity increased. However, his close association with the conservative Kiev League proved to be a political mistake.

The political scene was changing too rapidly for Hašek, who had difficulties in adapting himself to the chaos as Russia entered its revolutionary stage. He viewed the collapsing world around him from a position of a tsarophile and wrote a biting satire, The Czech Pickwick Club (Klub českých Pickwicků), against the Petrograd organization which was trying to unite the Czechs and Slovaks in Russia under one leadership. He was reprimanded by the leadership of the

Legion and sent to the front, where he participated in the last Russian offensive at Zborów in July 1917. Having been awarded the Medal of St. George (fourth class), he was later allowed to contribute to Čechoslovan.

Meanwhile, Masaryk correctly appraised the situation on the Eastern front as disastrous and decided to transfer the Czechoslovak Legion to France where the troops could continue to fight on the side of the Allies. Before such a transfer could take place, the political circumstances were further complicated by the October Revolution, by the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations, and--since the Legion was stationed near Kiev--by the creation of an independent Ukraine.

After the Bolshevik takeover, the legal status of the Legion became unclear. Prior to the October Revolution, the troops were under the Russian High Command, a force which fought against the Central Powers on the Eastern front. When the Russian army collapsed and the Soviet government entered into peace negotiations with Germany, the Czechs were still officially in a state of war. Since the Soviets signed the peace treaty at Brest-Litovsk, the National Council felt it no longer had any obligations towards the Bolshevik government. But being the only organized and well-equipped troops available, the Legion was wooed by the anti-Bolshevik generals, by Ukrainian politicians, and by the Soviets as well. Masaryk allowed nothing to interfere with his original plan to remove the troops from Russia and consequently from the Civil War. He declared the Legion to be

neutral and to be a part of the French, i.e., Allied forces. The Legion was supposed to reach Vladivostok and from there be transferred to Europe to join the Allies.

The revolutionary upheaval in Russia divided the Legion. Several pro-tsarist units wanted to fight the Bolsheviks and did so under Kornilov's command. But the real danger to the unity of the troops came from the leftist extremists who wanted to drag the Legion into the conflict and were supported by the Soviet government in their propagandist activities. Their attempt to destroy the Legion from inside and to overthrow the leadership of the Legion in February 1918 was unsuccessful. However, they continued to harass the units with heavy propaganda in order to break the soldiers' morale.

Hašek stood behind Masaryk's official platform for some time, at first even attacking the Bolshevik policies. But gradually, under the influence of his co-workers who were proponents of a socialist revolution, his views became more radical. The left wing of the Czech Social Democratic Party established its Central Executive Committee in Kiev, separated from the Legion and the National Council. While the leftists agreed with Masaryk's program of national liberation, after the October Revolution they found the double action of national and socialist revolution more attractive. In October 1917, the Czech Kiev pro-Bolshevik group, led by Alois Muna, published its own newspaper Svoboda (Freedom) with financial help from the Soviet government. In following

the group's instructions, Hašek took part in the abortive February takeover, mentioned above. When the Legion left Kiev, Hašek regarded its retreat as a betrayal of the revolution and of the Russian nation. However, the Czech Communists, despite their criticism of the Legion, did not fight the advancing German army either. They left the Ukraine with the Soviet troops at the same time as the Legion did and moved to Moscow.

Hašek, too, went to Moscow where he contacted the local Czech pro-Bolshevik organization and contributed to its newspaper Průkopník (Pioneer). He became a member of the Czechoslovak Section of the Russian Communist Party in the spring of 1918. But Muna distrusted Hašek and soon had him removed from the paper. In April he was dispatched to Samara to promote revolutionary propaganda among the Czech prisoners of war and the legionaries and to recruit them for the newly-formed Red Army. Meanwhile, the official policy of the Soviet government toward the Legion changed, and it disregarded the mutual agreement between Moscow and Masaryk. Trotsky masterminded a plan to disarm and retain well-trained troops in Russia in order to use them for the formation of Red Army units.[14] The fact that a significant number of legionaries were Russian (i.e., Soviet) citizens and that they served in the Russian Imperial Army (therefore could have been used as military specialists) was fully exploited by Trotsky from a legal point of view. However, the Czechs realized the danger of being marooned in Russia

as well as the impossibility of maintaining neutrality under such conditions. Armed conflicts broke out as the Czechs refused to obey Soviet demands. Trotsky issued an order to shoot any armed Czech, and the Legion retaliated by fighting back. The Czech Communists were very much to be blamed for this disastrous turn of events. They had overestimated their political influence on the troops. Despite the fact that their campaign to subjugate the Legion from the inside failed in February 1918, they persuaded Trotsky that the ordinary soldier-workers did not want to leave for France and would, in due time, join the Bolsheviks. Trotsky's skillfully prepared scheme would have worked but for the resistance of the ordinary soldiers who refused to cooperate and disarm peacefully.

This conflict has always been presented by Communist and some Western sources as the beginning of the Allied intervention and as a wilful act of the Czechs against the Soviet government. Victor Fic, the Western historian who devoted his research to the history of the Legion in Russia, documents that the conflict was precipitated by Moscow. As the Legion decided not to surrender but to reach Vladivostok as planned, the necessary military arrangements had to be considered. As a result, the attitude towards the Czech agitators working for the Soviet government changed, especially towards the recruiters for the Red Army, who had been grudgingly tolerated by the legionaries. When the hostilities broke out between the Bolsheviks and the Legion, the Commu-

nist propagandists were regarded as traitors by the legionaries. Hašek was among those the Legion wanted to arrest. It is thus a tragic fact that the most direct consequence of the October Revolution for the Czechs was their own small-scale civil war, fought far away from their home.

In the spring of 1918 (before these turbulent events took place in May 1918) Hašek underwent a period of self-doubt. Although a Red Army recruiter, he had adopted a lenient and cooperative attitude towards the Legion, which directly contrasted with the official line pursued by Trotsky. Hašek's friendly contact with the Legion in Samara was not at all appreciated by the Czech Communists. They expressed their disapproval at a meeting in Moscow in May 1918 on the occasion of the founding congress of the Communist Party where Hašek's ideological stand was questioned. Scrutinizing the available sources relating to this episode, we can assume that Hašek was probably expelled from the party.[15] Hašek's consequent behaviour supports this conclusion. When the Legion decided to fight its way through Siberia, it occupied first Penza and Samara. Hašek, who was asked by the Soviet officials to negotiate with the legionaries, refused and was found in disguise ready to flee. Soon afterwards the Red Army left Samara but Hašek did not follow his Red Army unit. He spent the summer months wandering among the Tartars.

In September of the same year, Hašek was in Simbirsk where he was imprisoned on charges of espionage but subse-

quently released due to the testimony of Czech soldiers from the Red Army who knew him. He was then sent to Bugulma to consolidate a newly-established Soviet regime in the town, and thereafter began his incredible career in the Red Army in Siberia. This time, probably for the first time in his life, Hašek felt the satisfaction of being really needed. His journalistic experience and formal education were now in demand by the Soviet authorities in Siberia; he was also sought for his knowledge of several languages. His qualifications earned him respect and speedy promotions: among other positions, he was appointed head of the International Section of the Political Department of the Fifth Army. He gave up drinking altogether, married a Russian girl (whom he did not inform about his previous marriage), and devoted himself entirely to his work, publishing a considerable number of Red Army newspapers in Russian, German, and Hungarian.

While Hašek was witnessing the Civil War in Russia, Czechoslovakia emerged as an independent state[16] in October 1918, with Masaryk as president. Despite the fact that the new government introduced many beneficial reforms and stabilized the economy, the situation crystallized politically after the debâcle of a leftist coup. The left wing of the Social Democratic Party tried unsuccessfully to establish a revolutionary soviet among workers in the mining town of Kladno, hoping for the same fruitful dénouement as the October Revolution had achieved in Russia. The process which led to the polarization of the Social Democratic Party in

Czechoslovakia was a counterpart of the earlier events in the Soviet Union, and it involved the same people. Muna, head of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in Russia, was sent to his native country in order to organize the left wing and split the Social Democrats. On 9 December 1920 the leftists occupied the headquarters of the party but were evicted by a court order. Their response was to call for a general strike. However, the Czechs were not attracted to world revolution and wanted to avoid the examples of Berlin and Budapest. After an initial success in Kladno, the strike was called off, only four days before Hašek (who was supposed to have taken part in the Kladno soviet) arrived.

Although the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was not founded until May 1921, its newspaper Rudé právo (Red Right) was already in circulation in the fall of 1920. It was edited by the well-known writer Ivan Olbracht and by the former leader of the Social Democratic Party, Bohumír Šmeral. It was Šmeral who became the first leader of the Communist Party, but his refusal to comply with the official line from Moscow and his reluctance to sacrifice his Marxist principles for Bolshevik doctrines led to his downfall. He was removed from power in 1929 and replaced by Klement Gottwald. As a result, the party lost its prestige among workers and intellectuals who left the party in large numbers, including the most prominent literary figures of the left wing: Ivan Olbracht, Vladislav Vančura, Stanislav K. Neumann, Marie Majerová, Josef Hora, and Jaroslav Seifert.

Although Hašek did not see the culmination of this conflict, he did witness its beginning because he was sent to Czechoslovakia in the fall of 1920 at the request of the Czech leftists, who needed experienced Communists for the planned enterprise in Kladno. According to Hašek's biographer Jaroslav Křížek, Hašek at first refused to leave Siberia, but realizing immediately the rashness of his decision he later obeyed.[17] All the Czech and Soviet sources agree that Hašek's mission was to continue his revolutionary work in Czechoslovakia.

Yet, there are suggestions which indicate that Hašek escaped from Russia. According to Hašek's friend Franta Sauer, the proletarian writer and first publisher of Švejk, Hašek ran away to Moscow after he was refused permission to leave Siberia. It seems that an unnamed member of the Moscow soviet helped Hašek by giving him a forged passport which took him out of Russia.[18] In one of his letters to Jarmila, dated 3 February 1921, Hašek also mentions that he escaped. He asks her to help him get a job; he explains that he still loves her and includes a photograph of himself "from the forged passport, made in Russia, when I was running home."[19] The Czech playwright and contemporary of Hašek, František Langer, reports that Hašek avoided direct questioning about his Bolshevik past and only mentioned that his return from the Soviet Union was made difficult for him, refusing to specify by whom or why.[20]

The most convincing proof of the fact that he did not

come back as a Communist is Hašek's own behaviour after his arrival in Prague in December 1920. Though it is true that the attempt to create a revolutionary soviet in Kladno had collapsed just a few days before, as an experienced apparatchik he ought to have been able to face temporary setbacks. As it was, Hašek did not join the newly-established Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, was critical of Czech Communists, and did not even secure for himself a steady job on the staff of Rudé právo, although he contributed to it.

Hašek certainly did not have an easy time, yet his literary work allowed him to buy a house and support his Russian wife. Evidently, the government of Czechoslovakia was not a vicious regime: the general amnesty permitted him to return and the bigamy charges against him were dropped, but he complicated his personal life by falling in love with his first wife. Still, Hašek was able to publish his feuilletons thanks to his pre-war journalist friends, and some of his stories even appeared in pro-government newspapers. Again, as before the war, Hašek devoted himself to writing and drinking, but now his alcoholism took on a suicidal form and hastened his death. When he died on 3 January 1923, his major work Švejk was left unfinished.

Although Hašek belongs to the generation of fin-de-siècle writers, he is referred to as a post-war man of letters. His rejection of literature as an art, his style--which the critic Radko Pytlík calls "barbaric,"[21] his

spontaneity and his preference for intuition rather than for taught ideas, and his nihilism and delight in the absurd are closer to post-war movements like dadaism than to pre-war literary trends. Hašek's kinship with dadaism has already been pointed out in scholarly literature of the inter-war period. In his article on "Dada," the prominent Czech critic František X. Šalda compared Hašek to Jacques Vaché, whom he described as "the French pendant to our Hašek: wild humour was to him an instrument for denying the world and life."[22]

Today, Hašek's dadaism is of general interest to the reading public and Hašek is perceived by literary critics as a modern European writer.[23]

## FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

[1]R. W. Seton-Watson, A History of the Czechs and Slovaks (Hutchinson & Co., 1943, reprint ed. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1965), pp. 232-33.

[2]Národní listy (1861-1941), was originally the newspaper of the Young Czech Party to which many leading Czech writers contributed. Jan Neruda (1834-1891) and Josef V. Sládek (1845-1912) were among its contributors at the end of the nineteenth century. Between 1917 and 1920 Karel Čapek (1890-1938) was associated with the newspaper, as was for many years Hašek's main protagonist, poet Viktor Dyk (1877-1931).

[3]Stanislav Kostka Neumann, a leading anarchist and lyrical poet (also involved in the Omladina treason trial staged by the government in 1893 against the Czech radical youth), founded an important anarchist journal, Nový kult, and later edited Communist newspapers. Initially he was an ardent exponent of Soviet Communism but left the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in 1929.

[4]Radko Pytlík, Toulavé house: Zpráva o Jaroslavu Haškovi (Prague: 1971), pp. 186-87. Hašek described this episode humorously in one of his stories, but Radko Pytlík in his biography on Hašek includes an analysis of Dr. Ludvík Šváb who is of the opinion that Hašek contemplated suicide (Ibid., pp. 385-87).

[5]The Czech National Socialist Party is not to be confused with Hitler's party of the same name.

[6]Several cabaret plays, which Hašek wrote himself or in collaboration with other members of Prague's bohème, show a new dimension of his talent and were published under the title Větrný mlynář a jeho dcera in 1976.

[7]Cecil Parrott, The Bad Bohemian: The Life of Jaroslav Hašek Creator of the Good Soldier Švejk (London: Bodley Head, 1978), p. 273.

[8]Pynsent, Czech Prose, p. xi. The Czech National Revival is usually placed into the period between the initial year of the Germanization of the schools in 1774 and the end of Prime Minister Alexander Bach's era in 1858.

[9]Josef Škvorecký, "Some Contemporary Czech Prose Writers," Novel, 4 (Fall 1970), pp. 7-8.

[10]Emanuel Frynta, Hašek the Creator of Schweik, trans. Jean Layton and George Theiner (Prague: 1965), p. 127.

[11]Robert A. Kann, A History of the Habsburg Empire: 1526-1918 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), pp. 533-34.

[12]Družina had originally over 700 volunteers. Later its numbers grew to 92,000 soldiers.

[13]J.F.N. Bradley, La Légion Tchécoslovaque en Russie: 1914-1920 (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1965), pp. 46-47. Of the sixteen thousand prisoners of war, six thousand did not survive the typhoid epidemics in Tockoe when Hašek was there.

[14]Victor M. Fic, The Bolsheviks and the Czechoslovak Legion: The Origin of Their Armed Conflict March-May 1918 (New Delhi: Abhimav Publications, 1978), p. 236.

[15]Radko Pytlík, Toulavé house pp. 307-309; Fic, Bolsheviks and Legion, p. 417 n.

[16]From 1918 to 1938 Czechoslovakia included the Czech lands (Bohemia, Moravia, part of Silesia), Slovakia (formerly the northern part of Hungary), and Ruthenia (Subcarpathian Russia).

[17]Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, pp. 309-10.

[18]Franta Sauer and Jiří Suk, In memoriam Jaroslava Haška (Prague: Družstevní nakladatelství, 1924), p. 40.

[19]Lidský profil Jaroslava Haška: Korespondence a dokumenty (Prague: 1979), Radko Pytlík, ed., p. 206.

[20]František Langer, Byli a bylo (Prague: 1963), p. 80.

[21]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 132.

[22]František X. Šalda, "Dada," Šaldův zápisník, 5 (Prague: Otto Girgal, 1932-1933), p. 427.

[23]After the "rehabilitation" of Kafka in Czechoslovakia following the conference organized in 1963 on the occasion of the anniversary of his birth, Hašek's work has been re-evaluated. Emanuel Frynta, in his essay on Hašek published in 1965, stresses his link with dadaism and surrealism, emphasizing the fact the the Czech satirist, though separated from the Western movements, created Švejk under the effect

of the same war experience which incited dadaism in Europe. Radko Pytlík goes even further, claiming that Hašek's temperament and his revolt against literary and behavioural conventions were precursory of Tzara's dadaism. He concludes that Hašek was underestimated before the First World War because he was ahead of his time, and society was not yet ready to accept him (Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 236; Frynta, Hašek), p. 14.

# CHAPTER I

## THE LITERARY PRANKSTER[1]

Hašek's first stories and his later short travel stories (*povídky z cest*) were all based on his encounters while wandering across the Slovak (then Hungarian) countryside or other foreign parts of central and southern Europe during the years 1901-1905. His early stories were all apolitical and written in the style of a traditional Czech realistic village story. Hašek's interest in the ordinary country folk was a typical characteristic of that pre-war generation which sought, in the peasantry, a relief from bourgeois conventions. Hašek and his contemporaries admired *Reinkultur* of Slovakia and urged a "return to nature."

Hašek's approach to country folk differed in significant ways from that of his colleagues. Hašek neither indulged in exotic descriptions of the countryside nor searched for ethnographic peculiarities to be studied, as was fashionable at the turn of the century. He was impressed by the way the country folk looked at life, particularly their views and methods of treating injustices. It was these impressions that led Hašek to unveil a new type of rural hero, the folk rogue (*lidový chytrák*), whose down-to-earth philosophy and instinct to survive was later immortalized in *Švejk*.[2]

The folk rogue was not a simpleton, rather he was a complex character displaying several dimensions. Out of many versions of the rogue created by Hašek, here are three characters presented--Gulaj (Fisherman Gulaj), Babám (Babám's Archaeological Efforts), and Jožka Šavaňů (From the Old Penitentiary in Ilava--in order to illustrate the varying complexities of Hašek's folk rogue.

In Fisherman Gulaj (Rybář Gulaj, 1902), the instinctive thinking of the rogue in order to survive is exemplified:

> Some of his [Gulaj's] principles were completely approved by the village. One of his maxims was that the Lord created nature and that only He could decide about it. Everybody is responsible for his deeds only to God. He put this religious philosophy into practice when poaching in his master's forest.[3]

Gulaj is a thief who helps his fellow villagers at the expense of his master; his criminality, his thieving is minimized--if not counterbalanced--by the performance of an act which aids the community.

Quite the contrary can be said about Babám--a harsh, egotistical and anti-social character from the story Babám's Archaeological Efforts (Babámovy archeologické snahy, 1920) who treats everybody with malicious contempt. He steals sheep from the local villagers and supplies Profesor Fálva, an archaeologist, with "ancient ceramics" bought from the village store. His own freedom is however sacrosanct, and anyone, such as the hermit, who attempts to impose a limit upon Babám meets with violence. In the case of the hermit, the violence was fatal:

> At that time a hermit settled down on Negrovec. When wandering Babám came to the hermit's mountain and was advised by him to abandon his nomadic life, Babám hit him on the head with an ax just a little bit. When he realized that the hermit did not survive it he buried him very piously and made a big wooden cross over the hermit's grave.[4]

Hašek does not dwell on Babám's lack of moral values and indicates that Babám's criminality was simply his giving into temptation, impulse, and greed.

Another story which shows Hašek's interest in the criminal mind is From the Old Penitentiary in Ilava (Ze staré trestnice v Ilavě, 1915). The main character, Jožka Šavaňů, is a social outcast and highway robber serving term in prison for his criminal activities. Contrary to Babám, Jožka emerges as a likeable individual, capable of reform. The extraordinary feature of Jožka's story is the manner in which Hašek depicts how life in a penitentiary can be improved by cooperation between prison officials and inmates who, to a certain degree, respect each other and make the best out of their situation. By transforming the criminal-murderer (Jožka) into a kind old man, Hašek succeeded in bringing his story to a meaningful ending and in the process created an excellent literary piece. The reformed Jožka, stands in sharp contrast to Babám, the nihilist, who lives his life-style at the expense of others, without regard for others, and without conscience.

Ilava is also interesting because of another character--the political prisoner Bérényi. As Hašek was familiar with this type of intellectual, due to his association with

anarchists, one would expect him to develop Bérényi as a positive revolutionary character. However, this is not the case because Bérényi is ridiculed in the story and described as an agitated freedom fighter whose incessant discussions about liberty leave other inmates (all sentenced for life) on the verge of exasperation and whose unbending behaviour is based on ideological principles far removed from the reality of life.

Neither the three main characters above, nor their stories, are overly concerned with the issue of social injustice. Only Gulaj realizes that nature was created for all, and by stealing he repossesses what was taken from him. Yet this is a subject which Hašek often discusses in his village stories. In the story Above Lake Balaton (Nad jezerem blatenským, 1952)[5] Hašek sympathizes again with the rebel-criminal, in this case a gypsy, Burga, who was found shot to death on the property of a rich landowner, Boll. Boll faces an inquiry about the incident, but the situation for him rapidly improves once the judge Béla tastes wine from Boll's vineyards. As a connoisseur, the judge can appreciate the excellent quality of the drink; and when he learns that the theft of the oldest and best wine caused the death of the gypsy, he agrees completely with the punitive action of Boll, thus closing the inquiry as an accident.

In this story of poignant social criticism Hašek does not question that the gypsy was a thief (criminal)--this was a fact of life: but the solution of having a rich man

punish the poor one by taking away his life and not suffer any consequences is remarkably depicted.

All the characters (Gulaj, Jožka, Babám, Burga), and the stories from which they are taken, reveal the diversity of Hašek's writing, as well as his interest in the country people whom he depicts realistically. Hašek's folk rogue is a multifaceted character, not always presented in a positive light, but possessed of various virtues and evils which reflect the society from which they spring. Hašek discovered and developed this particular hero: a type which, in the view of the Czech Marxist scholar Radko Pytlík, the school of Czech realistic literature overlooked.[6] Although Pytlík's point is valid, there is an explanation why the Czech realist writers did not notice the folk rogue. The majority of Hašek's travel stories are located in Slovakia, Hungary, or the Balkan countries, where traditionally the rich land-owners and the poor peasants represented the extremes of the social system, very different from the one-class bourgeois society of the Czech lands. The Czech realists can be criticized for not noticing the rogue among the Czech peasantry, but it is understandable that the character with criminal inclinations was not to be "typified" by them as representative of the Czech peasant. Only when Hašek transposed the rogue into a bourgeois city dweller called Švejk could the Czech public identify with the character, which became very popular. Hašek himself wrote a delightful story about his maternal grandfather Jareš, in Stories from the

Waterbailiff's Watchtower at Ražice (Historky z ražické bašty, 1908), whom he presents as a reliable, kind, conscientious, and uncorruptible member of the community, affirming the notion of the realistic writers of the period that the Czech peasant is a cornerstone of the Czech nation.

However, from the Marxist point of view, the folk rogue is presented as a hero who helps "to regenerate human dignity" and raise "the oppressed self-consciousness of the human masses."[7] This assumption may be valid in the case of Gulaj but is not correct in the case of Babám, whose actions (burglary, robbery, brigandage, and murder) are justified as individual rebellion against "the powerful."[8] The immorality of the murder and Babám's exploitation of the villagers (who actually represent the masses) as well as Fálva (who was a member of the bourgeois class and thus should be the exploiter) are overlooked. There is no exploration into Babám's lack of moral values or into unhappiness inflicted upon the society by his deeds. Hašek's clues that Babám's criminality was not a result of the society in which he lived, but a product of human nature giving into temptation and greed, are not considered by the Marxist scholars.

For ideological reasons, critics differ in their opinions on Ilava. Because Bérényi and his revolutionary message about freedom are satirized in the story, Ilava is judged from the Marxist point of view as a literary piece which "contains strong and weak points of Hašek's opinions before the war and before his ideological maturing in the

Red Army."[9] However, the American scholar of Czech descent and an authority on Czech literature Milada Součková acclaims the story for its literary value and observes that "if there had been a contest for the best short story of the year 1915, Hašek's 'Ze staré trestnice v Ilavě' would have been the winner."[10]

Although Hašek's class-consciousness is non-existent, he never sided with the wealthy nor governing classes in his short travel stories. Above Lake Balaton is a literary piece created by a socially committed writer. Most critics agree on the importance of the story, but Milada Součková goes even further when she compares the modernity in Hašek's treatment of social injustice to the writing of Albert Camus.[11]

From its very beginnings, Hašek's folk rogue was a rebel-criminal, and he remained so later when Hašek transposed him into the city, which became Hašek's main source of inspiration. After his wandering experiences Hašek became interested in anarchism, the working class, and the urban poor.

At this point, Hašek rebelled not only against the realistic tradition of his previous work but also against the modern trends of the period. He developed a "barbaric" style which, in its primitiveness, reflected Hašek's association with the non-literary branch of the anarchist movement. His anti-literary stance (neliterárnost) was and is viewed as a revolt against the "official" literature and its

aesthetic values.[12] Neumann, Těsnohlídek, and other adherents of sophisticated literary anarchism were critical of Hašek's work, particularly his crude style.[13] Hašek further annoyed socially conscious writers by his censorious attitude towards the so-called "social" literature (intended for the enlightenment of the working masses) published by the social democratic newspapers. It has to be pointed out that many members of the Czech intelligentsia were devoted to the proletarian cause and were seriously engaged in it. But Hašek accused this literary group of lacking revolutionary goals and being overburdened by sentimentality.

Yet, closer investigation of his own articles of this period reveals the very same deficiencies which he criticized in others. A typical example can be found in Our House (Náš dům, 1904) wherein the narrator and the exponent of the social message, Lojzík, a little boy, makes comments which arouse sentimental emotions towards the proletariat. However, the message is marred by his propagandistic exclamation about intimidating the rich when he reaches adulthood:

> Now I can scare the sparrows--damn it all! When I grow up, you better believe me that I will scare people! And alive! When I look at coughing mammy, and all of us--it seems to me that the old mason from the attic was right. And why should people be afraid of such beggars like us, if they did not have bad consciences? And so I feel like doing more than just scaring them, but well, we shall see![14]

The story is as sentimental as the lacrymose social prose of that period, and the ending is naive because the revolution, as a rule, does not necessarily bring about a quick social

improvement. By the time Lojzík becomes an adult, social changes can be introduced by parliamentary process (as was the actual case). If the lawful way was too slow for Hašek the anarchist, his own suggestion does not prove to be the most expeditious, either.

It is precisely for the revolutionary hint that Hašek is praised by the Soviet critic Elanskij, who considers Hašek's idea original in Czech literature.[15] Nevertheless, Hašek was unable to combine literary quality with the ideological demands of anarchism, because his literary contributions of this period are judged far below his short travel stories.[16] It is also interesting to note that there are not many stories of Hašek which deal directly with the working class, except the ones published during his anarchist periods (1904, 1906-1907), and the revolutionary hint about Lojzík's future seems to represent the acme of Hašek's revolutionary ideas before the war. Hašek's literary anarchism was of short duration and he did not create a lasting proletarian character nor did he develop a revolutionary hero similar to his folk rogue.

However, Hašek's interest in the urban poor and the lumpen-proletariát proved to be durable. He was particularly keen on exploring their criminal character analogously with his povídky z cest. With no ideological scruple in this regard, Hašek was capable of being detached and creating either a story in which he sides with the poor (especially criminals) or a story in which he subjects them to ridicule.

In The Expedition of Šejba the Thief (Výprava zloděje Šejby, 1913) the hero-criminal waits in a building in order to steal whatever he can from the attic during the night. His expedition ends up badly because he is unexpectedly attacked and beaten by two angry wives, waiting for their drunken husbands (both were court officials whom Šejba knew only too well from his trial). Šejba hurriedly leaves, happy to be free, although his shoes and "instruments" were taken from him during the unpleasant encounter. Thus he is now poorer than he was before.

In this story Hašek once again does not question the morality of a criminal act. Šejba is portrayed as a luckless, comic thief who is considered a criminal in the eyes of the law, but in essence he behaves as a hard-working man--first he drinks his bottle of rum, then he turns to a prayer hoping to do a good job so he can pay the bills from his profit.

Money and the poor are also the main idea of Idyll from the Almshouse in Žižkov (Idyla z chudobince na Žižkově, 1913). In this story Hašek describes the greed of a group of poor women. During the administration of extreme unction, Father Toman gave money to grandmother Pintová, who splurged the money on good food and hard liquor and consequently improved her health. Thereupon, other women, in hope of receiving a similar sum, claim they are dying. Eventually, the situation gets out of hand and the city council decrees:

At the insistence of the chaplains it has decreed that

> the old women should be prohibited from dying on their own initiative. It has further laid down that extreme unction will in future always be administered in the almshouse once a month, and to all of them at one go. As a result the grandmothers' takings are now extremely meagre.[17]

The old women are not depicted kindly; they bicker over whose turn it is to die first. And Hašek closes the story in a manner typical of his writings (death, lunacy, suicide): "Mrs Vaňková hanged herself a fortnight ago, because the illustrious town council of Žižkov would not give her permission to die."[18]

These two stories show Hašek as a writer who has little sympathy for his characters from an ideological point of view. His primary concern was a good story, and in order to achieve this goal he was capable of satirizing the poor and the criminals as well as ridiculing the rich.

It can be concluded that Hašek was interested in the working class, but his interest was temporary. He rebelled against the established relations between workers and the intelligentsia and considered the program of socially conscious writers ineffective. Yet his own revolutionary message was inadequate and his writings about the working class lacked consistency. Although the Marxist scholars put great emphasis on Hašek's proletarian writings, it is to be noted that he published about fifty articles in the anarchist newspapers, which is a disproportionately small number considering Hašek's literary output of twelve hundred stories during his lifetime. It is true that Hašek pub-

lished in other newspapers (Our House appeared for instance in Národní listy), but a higher number of proletarian writings does not alter radically the over-all picture: Hašek did not become a champion of the working class and he never developed a proletarian character.

Elanskij notices the absence of the proletarian themes in Hašek's work and offers this explanation:

> Yet the main subjects of Hašek's satirical portrayal were not the positive forces of contemporary society--the proletariat and its allies--but the conservative, reactionary pillars of the capitalist system.[19]

While it is true that Hašek did satirize the "pillars" of the capitalist system (bourgeoisie, aristocracy, church), it is also valid that he satirized those who sympathized with the working class--the Czech intelligentsia and the urban poor.

There are several possible explanations why Hašek did not satirize workers. First, Hašek was an anarchist, an anti-authoritarian, and because the proletariat was not in power, he was not threatened by this class and had no need for satirizing it. Secondly, although he often published in journals for the workers, they did not pass judgement on his writings as the intellectuals did. Thirdly, Hašek's upbringing was thoroughly bourgeois and the proletarian milieu was not really congenial to his nature; otherwise his sojourn among the miners in northern Bohemia would have lasted longer than four weeks. His interest in the proletariat was only temporary and his gift as a literary artist lay in

depicting underworld criminals, bohemian Prague, the bourgeosie, and the establishment. He was far better equipped to create stories about social groups other than the proletariat. Thus, it seems more probable that the absence of proletarian themes in his writings is due to his lack of inspiration, which otherwise was abundant where other classes were concerned.

If Hašek proved to be incapable of satirizing the working class successfully, the opposite is true about the Czech and German middle class which was a primary target of his social satire. Hašek was pitiless in his criticism of the bourgeoisie which, at the turn of the century, consisted mainly of officials, teachers, shopkeepers, small businessmen, politicians, and artists. He laughed at their way of life, their values, ideals, and aspirations and accused them of hypocrisy. As an anarchist he propagated the usefulness of literature and its accessibility to the masses. Hence, his rejection of the epigons of fin-de-siècle literary trends and his rebellion against the incomprehensible phraseology of modern poetry. He ridiculed his literary contemporaries in About Poets (O básnících, 1907) because they wrote sad poems about human existence while they themselves enjoyed all the available pleasures of life. To him, modern poetry was artificial and the modern poets were hypocrites.

Hašek also ridiculed the intelligentsia in general and teachers or professionals in particular. For the sharp satire contained in The Commercial Academy (Obchodní

akademie, 1909), Hašek faced a libel suit which forced him to retract his statements and publicly apologize to the director of the school, Řežábek. In the story, the director's name is Jeřábek and Hašek mocks his sense of self-importance:

> Although he knows he is a government counsellor and understands the full significance of this title, yet none the less he condescends occasionally to talk even to the junior teachers. Of course he shouts at them from time to time, but again there's nothing wrong in that, because he is rector, government counsellor etc. etc. . . . He obtained the title for his merits, his pedagogical and literary activity and his knowledge of twelve languages. But because twelve languages is a large number, it occasionally happens that he forgets that there is a certain language he does not know.[20]

Similarly, Hašek ridiculed scholars, especially those German experts whose knowledge was used to further German nationalism. In From the Times of the Census (Z doby sčítání lidu, 1911) Hašek depicted one of the worst problems of that period--illegal pressure on the Czech population in the so-called "mixed" regions, where Czechs and Germans lived side by side but became bitter enemies during the election year as the Germans tried to hold on to power. In order to retain their majority, the Germans used illegal means to obtain the votes. In the story Hradčanský's claim of Czech nationality led him to a court appearance, wherein professor Habensdorfer, an expert on linguistics, explains that Hradčanský is of German origin because his name is really derived from an old German word Gradschin. On the basis of professor Habensdorfer's testimony, "the German regenade" Hradčanský is sentenced to three weeks of imprisonment for deception of the court, although to every Czech it is clear

that his name was derived from Hradčany (Prague Castle).

Along with ridiculing German nationalism, Hašek also rejected the exaggerated national feeling of his compatriots, the pride of Czechs in their history. In the story The Traitor to the Fatherland at Chotěboř (Zrádce národa v Chotěboři, 1912), he narrated an incident which had happened to a participant at a mass-meeting, whom everybody avoided because:

> The man betrayed the whole Czech nation and his name is Jan Pavlíček, farmer from Sviny. The history of his betrayal is captivating and is dated from the time when the revived Czech nation organized great demonstrations and those mass-meetings in the year of sixty-eight.[21]

Jan Pavlíček joins the procession of carriages but, due to his indulgence in good food and excessive beer drinking, is forced to find quickly a convenient place to relieve himself. When he finds a big tree, he fails to notice a sign which ought to remind any good Czech of his extraordinary past: "Under this oak Žižka rested on the march to Přibyslav." Thus Pavlíček betrayed the Czech nation--to soil such a venerated place is inexcusable if one respects properly the Hussite tradition.

Hašek, who despised the false admiration of historical tradition, was also irritated by the hypocritical behaviour of contemporary society. As Vostokova observes:

> . . . Hašek the humorist displayed an extraordinary ingenuity: the skill of using everyday themes in order to criticize sharply the middle class. The stories give a true satirical group portrayal of Prague and the provincial bourgeoisie with its low interests, shallow greedy calculations, cheap vanity, and banal philistine wisdom.[22]

Hypocrisy prevalent in the society of Austria-Hungary provided Hašek with an inextinguishible source of inspiration, and the Czech (and German) middle class never disappointed him in this respect. He based his humorous stories (humoresky) on this vice, knowing that they would be a success. To disparage the bourgeois morality was a priority for him as a satirist and as a rebelling member of that particular class. In the story The Consecration of the Flag of the Catholic Club (Svěcení praporu katolického spolku, 1910) Hašek mocks the double standard of the contemporary morality:

> The privilege of embroidering the flag led to disputes between the maidens of the club. Only an innocent maiden is allowed to do embroidery, but because at the age when the girls are still innocent they have not yet learned how to embroider, there was great argument. Finally it was decided that the work should be done by the sisters Frýbert, and they embroidered the flag honourably, although evil tongues alleged that the younger sister had to hurry a great deal to have the flag ready in time.[23]

In addition to presenting morality as one of his favorite themes, Hašek also attacked further in the story an important group of Austro-Hungarian society--the church.

Hašek's anti-establishment satire consists of articles ridiculing the army, the administration, and the secret police, but the Catholic Church was the institution most frequently and fiercely attacked by him. However, anti-clericalism was not a trend which originated with the anarchists. It existed throughout the nineteenth century in the Czech lands and was supported especially by the intelligentsia, because the higher clerical hierarchy was con-

sidered by the Czechs as an anti-Czech, pro-dynastic force, faithful to the monarchy.[24] The church supervised the educational system and exercized great influence on governmental and public affairs, which consequently alienated the Czechs. This estrangement worsened with time--while the older generation was anti-clerical but religious (as was for instance Tomáš G. Masaryk), the pre-war generation of Hašek openly professed atheism and considered the church as the most reactionary part of the Habsburg establishment.

Thus Hašek's rebellion against the church was an attitude shared by many of his literary contemporaries. He felt free to criticize and mock Catholic dogma, church-goers, missionaries (who frequently end up by being eaten by smart cannibals), priests (usually depicted as hard-drinking, fat, lazy and lustful individuals), and catechists (always mean and spiteful men, believing in harsh corporal punishment).

Being a nihilist and an anarchist, Hašek attacked the church from this position, keenly observing the discrepancies between proclaimed religious ideals and reality. In the story <u>At the Divinity Lesson</u> (V hodině náboženství, 1914) Hašek depicts how pupils in school were punished for not knowing the catechism:

> The only thing that the children of Koroupov knew about religion was that dear God in his unending goodness created the birch. And after the birch the catechist Horáček. Both these things were complementary. . . . The children soon discovered that religious ideas were to be found not in the catechism but in that part of their breeches which they sat on.[25]

Hašek always described the catechists in the same vein.

Similarly, the stories about the priests and the monks are very repetitious, thematically speaking. It seems that even though Hašek was justified in criticizing the church, his views have to be regarded as one-sided and his criticism cannot be generalized because he never attempted to penetrate the philosophy of Christianity or its spiritual aspect in a serious way.[26]

Besides writing many highly exaggerated stories about the church, Hašek succeeded in unveiling a true-to-life clerical character: that of an army chaplain, which he would later develop and immortalize in his novel. Before the war, the army chaplain character appeared in the first cycle of short stories about Švejk, which was published in 1911. In one of the stories, The Good Soldier Švejk Provides Wine for the Mass (Dobrý voják Švejk obstarává mešní víno), Hašek noticed the irony in the vocation of the army chaplain who represents simultaneously Christ's pacifist teachings and army discipline:

> The army vicar apostolic, Koloman Belopotzký, bishop of Trical, appointed Augustin Kleinschrodt chaplain of the garrison in Trient. There is a great difference between an ordinary cleric, that is to say a civilian priest, and an army chaplain. The latter perfectly combines religion with soldiering so that two utterly distinct castes are compounded together in him and the difference between the two types of clergy is as great as that between a lieutenant of the dragoons who instructs at a military riding academy and the owner of a riding school.[27]

If Hašek was critical of the representatives of the church, his contempt for the army chaplain was doubled, because he represented yet another institution of the monarchy--the

imperial army.

The anti-military writings of Hašek are considered provocative and courageous (considering the governmental censorship), but neither extraordinary nor revolutionary by the standards of Hašek's contemporaries. Anti-militarism was a common feeling among the Czechs and deeply troubled the government in Vienna. Even the legally recognized political parties (anarchists were viewed as an illegal movement) pursued an anti-military policy because of their sympathies for Southern Slavs and detestation for the imperial army (patterned after the Prussian army, this Austrian institution retained the official German language and was contemptuous of Slav soldiers). The government, however, immediately subdued any form of discontent, as in the case of the infamous anti-militarist trials of young members of the National Socialist Party, at the time of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 and the Balkan war of 1912.

In the atmosphere of the trials, Hašek published his anti-military writings, but because of censorship he had to be circumspect when satirizing the army. The pre-war Czech anti-military literature depicted soldiers who suffered under army discipline and military drills, were abused by their superiors and missed their personal freedom.[28] However, Švejk was a different character from the very beginning. He went into the army "with a happy heart" and by following orders of the military succeeded in completely upsetting the army machinery. When his superiors can no longer cope with

him they decide to get rid of him by "superarbitration"--by releasing him from the army on grounds of stupidity. All other soldiers are envious of Švejk, but he wants to stay:

> . . . "I am going to serve His Imperial Majesty to my last breath. Here I am and here I stay. When I am a soldier, I must serve His Imperial Majesty and no one can chuck me out of the army, not even if the general himself came, kicked me in the backside and threw me out of the barracks. I should only come back to him and say: 'Humbly report, sir, I want to serve His Imperial Majesty to my very last breath and I am returning to the company.'"[29]

Here Hašek partially parodies the military oath, and in a similarly mocking manner he ridicules in his satire other branches of the establishment--the judicial system, the ministries, and the secret police.

In Old Man Jančár (Stařeček Jančár, 1908) Hašek even refers to the untouchable figure of the Head of State. The story depicts the plight of an old crippled beggar, Jančár, who tries to get himself into prison because he has no place to live (except the street) during the winter months. Some more experienced robbers advise him of an infraction of the law--a violation of the name of His Imperial Majesty--for which the authorities would give no less than a six-month sentence in jail. Thus Jančár is well taken care of during the winter--food, lodgings, and medical care included.

In another article written with macabre humour, To His Excellency, Herr von Biliňsky, Minister of Finance, Vienna (Jeho Excellenci ministru financí ryt. Biliňskému ve Vídni, 1910), Hašek is eager to "help" to ameliorate the desperate financial situation of the monarchy, and at the same time he

parodies administrative jargon to perfection:

> To His Excellency, Herr von Biliński, Minister of Finance, Vienna. Inspired by patriotic feelings, the undersigned respectfully takes the liberty of proposing to the most Honourable Ministry of Finance a draft bill for the introduction of a tax on burials and deaths. The recent exceptional rise in the number of undertakers' establishments has inspired me with the idea of a means for improving the national finances by instituting a State monopolization of death. Since people continually die, the State would be thus assured of a permanent annual revenue, which in times of epidemics or war might register a gratifying increase according to circumstances.[30]

This particular feuilleton helps the finances of Austria-Hungary as Švejk helps to run the army. With the same disrespect which he shows for the policy makers in Vienna Hašek also treats the secret police. Thanks to his personal knowledge and his writer's imagination, he is well equipped to create a category of characters which, later in Švejk, would become the famous Bretschneider.

In Persecution of the Party by Government Circles (Perzekuce nové strany vládními kruhy, 1937) Hašek describes how Mister Markup, a secret agent, was sent to report on the activities of the Party of Moderate Progress, whose members were supposedly anarchists and therefore non-believers and morally base. Markup is, however, recognized by one of Hašek's friends and they draw him into their "conspirational" conversation about politics and Czech history. Despite the fact that Markup asks good questions in order to compromise the young people, they turn the tables on him by pretending to be the most loyal subjects of the monarchy:

> Mr. Markup smiled affably: "Don't you think, gen-

> tlemen, that the Emperor Ferdinand was an outstanding man?
>
> "He certainly was," I said solemnly. "A man who in 1620 could stamp on the neck of the hydra of revolt was definitely a most honourable man, especially when you consider that he belonged to the noble House of Habsburg."
>
> "Well, but look," said Mr. Markup, "after all he did have all those Czech lords executed in the Old Town Square."
>
> "Perhaps you regret that, sir?" I shouted savagely. "Surely it was a mild punishment for rebels who threw the King's Commissioners out of the windows of the Royal Castle, deposed their own king, called a foreigner to Bohemia and killed in battles more than 20,000 of their own king's troops. And you would defend such people? Are you a Czech, sir? Are you not ashamed of yourself? I am sure that in a moment you'll start talking about the Hungarian Revolution of 1848, praising Kossuth and saying what a fine chap he was. And that's the blackguard who forged bank notes and stirred up all the Magyars from the puszta against the Habsburg dynasty, and, when he should have been hanged, ran away--the scoundrel! And now you calmly come here and begin to defend him, you praise the Hungarian Revolution and shout, 'Long live the Revolution!'"
>
> "But gentlemen, I assure you I never said anything of the kind."
>
> I got up. "These gentlemen here are my witnesses that you did. Didn't he say so, boys?"[32]

The boys--Hašek's friends--agree with Hašek, accuse Markup of anti-dynastic opinions (treason), and it is the secret agent, unable to defend himself, who is led away by the police. Hašek here employs the twist for which his satirical writings are famous, when the accused character gets out of trouble and his adversary entangles himself.

Hašek's anti-establishment satire is well appreciated by the critics in general. However, the Marxist critics prefer Hašek's anti-religious and anti-military writings. Elanskij claims that the stories about Švejk are great works of critical realism, not only of Czech but of world liter-

ature.[33] On the other hand, in the view of the British scholar Robert Pynsent, those stories "written in a primitivist style . . . are straightforward anti-military satire."[34]

Hašek's pre-war work also includes a significant amount of political satire. Due to his keen sense of observation, talent for parody, and his journalistic background, he found the political scene of Austria-Hungary highly inspirational. He not only satirized Austrian policies and policy makers but also concentrated equally, if not more so, on Czech politics and public figures. His criticisms of the electoral system, the "beer" politics of the Czechs, the parliamentary bickerings, and political parties were often penetrating.

He rebelled against what was expected from him as a political satirist on three accounts: he ridiculed all Czech political representation in his articles, often attacking people instead of issues; he used real names of public figures in fictitious situations, which made him not only vulnerable to libel suits but made more enemies than friends among the politically engaged intelligentsia; and lastly, Hašek rebelled against the traditionally accepted obligation of a Czech satirist to take the interest of the Czech nation seriously. This was not without consequences for Hašek.

He was disappointed in the anarchists, he disliked the internationalism of the Social Democrats, he mocked the gradualist policy of Masaryk's Realist Party, and he despised the compromising attitude of all other political parties.

Although he was involved with the Social Democratic Party and the National Socialist Party, his association with them was not out of conviction but the necessity of having a job, and it did not imply any loyalty on his part. Nevertheless, it helped him to observe the party apparatus from inside, and Hašek used this knowledge with relish in his articles.

Other parties were not immune to Hašek's attacks either. The Young Czech Party, with its leader Karel Kramář (future Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia), was a frequent subject of Hašek's acid feuilletons. In the article Dr Karel Kramář (1909) Hašek portrays him as an innovative politician of so-called "positive politics" on whom the Czech nation can safely rely in times of need, because Kramář always leaves for his estates in Crimea (his wife was a Russian), waiting for the tempest to pass over. Thus, by doing nothing, he helps Czech voters. Masaryk's Realistic Party was subjected to similar ridicule. Because the core of the party was composed of serious Czech scholars, Hašek could not resist poking fun at "the party of philosophers" by mocking their assiduous search for answers to contemporary problems in which they compile as many sources as possible to prove their points of view. According to Hašek, all their "sources" would turn the Sahara desert into a land of plenty, as he maintains in the article The Realistic or Progressive Party (Strana realistická čili pokroková, 1910).

That Hašek would criticize the bourgeois parties of Kramář or Masaryk is understandable because of his anarchist

sympathies. Yet these sympathies are not evident when he attacked the leftist organizations. The Social Democratic Party and its leader Bohumír Šmeral (future founder of the Communist Party) were targets of his satire, and so were the teachings of Marx.

The article It Happened Recently (Nedávno se stalo, 1908) was written in the form of a letter in which Deputy Kanoušek defends himself against a recent attack of the press, which accused him of uncivilized conduct in parliament. The manner in which Kanoušek justifies his behaviour only accentuates the truth that he is an ignoramus who, despite being illiterate, embarks on a successful political career simply by following the party's instructions on how to campaign. Three years of primary school makes him a man of intelligence by the Social Democratic Party's standards, and he is required only to remember that every speech has to contain lies, bad names, insults, and most importantly, Marx. Marx's teachings seem to be an insurmountable problem, but Kanoušek turns the corner when he realizes that he does not have to study Marx, just talk about him.

Hašek does not show any sympathy for the proletarian party, as one would expect from him. It is also ironical that he, who rebelled against education, should criticize anybody for his lack of it. It seems that nihilism and political cynicism were the most prevalent attitudes in his political satire, because Hašek just as unmercifully writes about the anarchists.

He wrote a biting satire on Karel Pelant, editor of the atheist newspaper Volná myšlenka (Free Thought), which surpasses the acidity of any of Hašek's articles concerned with the piety of Catholics. Similarly, the youngest participant of the Omladina trial, the anarchist Ziegloser, is ridiculed in The Revolutionary Ziegloser (Revolucionář Ziegloser, 1924) because he became a proper bourgeois, selling French cognac. His only revolutionary activity is whistling La Marsellaise.

The articles presented above show Hašek as a political satirist who ridiculed all political parties and tried to discredit them. As a result, he discredited himself and was considered a man without principles. In addition, many of his articles can be called nothing but slashing. In The Czech Maiden of Orleans, Miss Süss (Česká panna orleánská, slečna Süssová, 1925) Hašek did not concentrate on ridiculing any literary or political issue, but he maliciously disparaged a female journalist's physical appearance, for which she was hardly to blame. Despite the fact that Hašek was able to create a comical story, he was irresponsible in his lack of self-censorship. He refused to acknowledge that political satire required a great deal of tact and sense of proportion on the part of the writer. Using the real names of living people in fictitious situations, as he did in this particular piece, was dangerous ground for a satirist.[35] Although satirists do not always differentiate between libel and satire, there is an agreement that "lampooning of indi-

viduals for the malicious pleasure of the thing, . . . is detestable."[36]

Hašek did not apply this distinction in practice and this is the reason why his book The Social and Political History of the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law (Sociální a politické dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona, 1964) was not published in his lifetime nor later during the Masaryk Republic. Although in the book Hašek lampooned the political climate of Prague before the war, he included sketches about leading figures in cultural and political life (Miss Süss--for example), among them many of his friends or relatives. Hašek's book is considered original, with many excellent observations (the story about Mr. Markup is a remarkable satirical piece), but the problematic issue of libel cannot be discarded. If Hašek used his privilege as a satirist to criticize, then society had the right to defend itself against his attacks. Hašek's irresponsibility and disregard for the feelings of others made it difficult for his contemporaries to appreciate him. Evidently, Hašek wanted it both ways--as a political satirist he used pseudonyms in order to protect himself but denied the same right to many people who became the characters in his literary pieces.

Hašek's rebellious attitude against the behavioural code of his times also included his lack of understanding of the role which a political satirist played in Austria-Hungary. As a member of the Czech minority, he refused to

see that his fierce attacks on all Czech political representation pleased the government in Vienna. In Parrott's view, this is the reason why Hašek was not imprisoned more frequently or harrassed, as was the most outstanding Czech journalist and satirist Karel Havlíček Borovský.[37] Borovský, who was sent to exile, remained steadfast in his beliefs about what it meant to be a Czech and a liberal journalist. The difference between the two was that of a moral engagement. Hašek, by his indiscriminate criticizing, helped those he disliked most--the Habsburg establishment.

However, Hašek's political satire is given special prominence by the Marxist critics. Hašek's use of real names is justified as a "realistic portrayal of the times"[38] and his irresponsibility is not questioned. Hašek's rejection of political parties is viewed as a correct one because the political program of the parties at that time did not follow scientific socialism.[39] Thus Hašek's political immaturity is not even considered.

Yet from Hašek's record one can assume that if the proper revolutionary organization had existed before the war, Hašek would not have granted it any immunity against his attacks. He had no revolutionary philosophy of his own which would have changed the system, and his position was that of total opposition to everything. He rebelled against the established political parties as well as the newly organized ones. His answer to the political problems was to establish the Party of Moderate Progress. It was an excel-

lent farce, but for all practical purposes impossible to apply in real life.

To summarize, Hašek has to be judged before the war as a rebel, not a revolutionary.[40] He sympathized with criminals and those powerless against authority. He also sided with the rural and urban poor, yet was capable of satirizing them just as effectively. It is easier to conclude that he never sympathized with the rich. This makes him a socially conscious writer, but certainly not a class-conscious one. His class-consciousness is debatable because the proletarian themes do not figure prominently in his writings. Moreover, some of Hašek's best stories are the ones where Hašek's class-consciousness is clearly erratic (Ilava). His portrayal of the rural poor in his povídky z cest (which are by some critics considered the cream of Hašek's stories) is more moving than his articles about the proletariat with their utopian messages. In his pre-war literary career Hašek did not develop a revolutionary character with a proletarian background. The most original contribution to Czech literature is Hašek's folk rogue (rebel-criminal).

Hašek rebelled against all authority, secular or religious. As his initially idealistic anarchism changed into nihilist scepticism, he criticized all existing institutions (educational system, church, army, government and its branches, all political representation) as being useless. However, he himself never offered a solution to any contemporary problem nor helped to find an alternative to change

the status quo. His political unrealiability caused him not to be taken seriously and his perpetual opposition discredited him. Because Hašek saw nothing good in society and rejected it, one can identify him as a "misanthropic" satirist.[41]

Hašek's rebellion against bourgeois conventions is full of contradictions. He rejected the values and principles of the class he belonged to (by birth, upbringing, and profession), yet remained, in essence, a bourgeois. He looked down on education while he himself had finished the Commercial Academy and criticized others for the lack of it. He ridiculed morality or the lack of it in bourgeois households, yet his own marital life was far from exemplary. His attacks on the church were legendary; however, he himself had a church wedding and never divorced his first wife.

Nevertheless, Hašek saw the contradictions in himself, the absurdities of the monarchial system and, most of all, the hypocrisy of society. He was an intuitive writer who never judged the world from an academic position but recorded how he felt about his milieu.

Albert Camus, in his book The Rebel, examined the society of Hašek's time;

> The bourgeoisie succeeded in reigning during the entire nineteenth century only by referring itself to abstract principles. Less worthy than Saint-Just, it simply made use of this frame of reference as an alibi, while employing, on all occasions, the opposite values. By its essential corruption and disheartening hypocrisy, it helped to discredit, for good and all, the principles it proclaimed. Its culpability in this regard is infinite.[42]

This was the bourgeois world which Hašek so despised and rebelled against, yet it was his tragedy that he could not live without it and was part of it.[43]

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1]Robert Pynsent, "The Last Days of Austria: Hašek and Kraus," The First War in Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Holger Klein (London: Macmillan Press, 1976), p. 138.

[2]Radko Pytlík, "Vznik satirického typu v tvorbě Jaroslava Haška," O české satiře: Sborník statí, ed. František Buriánek (Prague: 1959), p. 271.

[3]Jaroslav Hašek, Črty, povídky a humoresky z cest, Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol 1, ed. Zdena Ančík and František Daneš (Prague: 1955), pp. 81-82.

[4]Jaroslav Hašek, Procházka přes hranice: První dekameron, ed. Milan Jankovič and Radko Pytlík (Prague: 1976), p. 416.

[5]Due to Hašek's negligence in keeping his manuscripts in order, many of his stories were misplaced. Some of them were found and published either later in his life (Babám) or posthumously (Balaton), although Hašek wrote them before the First World War.

[6]Radko Pytlík, "Lidovost v Haškových povídkách z cest," Česká literatura 7 (1959), pp. 2-3.

[7]Ibid., p. 8.

[8]Ibid., p. 4.

[9]Radko Pytlík, "Na okraj Haškovy sociální satiry," an Afterword to Loupežný vrah před soudem by Jaroslav Hašek, Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol 2, ed. Zdena Ančík and Radko Pytlík (Prague: 1958), p. 406.

[10]Milada Součková, A Literary Satellite: Czech-Russian Literary Relations (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970), p. 41.

[11]Ibid., p. 42.

[12]Radko Pytlík, "Hašek literární a neliterární," Nový život 11 (1959), p. 45.

[13]Ibid., pp. 41, 47.

[14]Hašek, Loupežný vrah, p. 28.

[15]Elanskij, Gašek, p. 12.

[16]Cecil Parrott, Jaroslav Hašek: A Study of Švejk and the Short Stories (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 60.

[17]Hašek, Red Commissar, p. 64. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Elanskij, Gašek, p. 17.

[20]Parrott, Bad Bohemian, p. 43. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[21]Jaroslav Hašek, Lidožroutská historie: Druhý dekameron, ed. Radko Pytlík (Prague: 1979), p. 382.

[22]S. Vostokova, Jaroslav Gašek (Moscow: 1964), p. 36.

[23]Parrott, Study, p. 77. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[24]Seton-Watson, History, p. 201.

[25]Parrott, Study, p. 79. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[26]Ibid., p. 78.

[27]Hašek, Red Commissar, p. 199. Trans. Cecil Parrott. Hašek's pre-war short stories about Švejk include Švejk Stands Against Italy, The Good Soldier Švejk Provides Wine for the Mass, The Good Soldier Švejk and the Superarbitration Procedure, The Good Soldier Švejk Learns How to Handle Gun Cotton and The Good Soldier Švejk Operates in Aeroplanes. Later in Russia Hašek wrote The Good Soldier Švejk in Captivity. These short stories are not to be confused with Hašek's novel which was written after Hašek's return to Czechoslovakia in 1920.

[28]Pytlík, "Vznik satirického typu," pp. 268-69. At first, Hašek followed this trend of anti-military literature. In Der Verfluchte Ruthene (1908) he depicts sentimentally the unhappiness of a young Ruthenian soldier. A year earlier Hašek published another anti-military story About a Good Swedish Soldier (O hodném švédském vojákovi) who freezes to death rather than leave his post. The expression "good" (hodný) is a satirical allegory. The "bad" (nehodný) meant the anti-militarists.

[29]Hašek, Red Commissar, p. 207, Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[30]Hašek himself was surprised that the story was permitted to be published.

[31]Hašek. Red Commissar, p. 85. Trans. Cecil Parrott. The story was translated by Cecil Parrott under the title Hašek's Effort to Improve the Finances of the Monarchy.

[32]Ibid., p. 272. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[33]Elanskij, Gašek, p. 25.

[34]Pynsent, "Last Days of Austria," p. 138.

[35]Gilbert Highet, The Anatomy of Satire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), pp. 234-35.

[36]Robert C. Elliott, The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 229.

[37]Parrott, Study, pp. 76-77.

[38]Radko Pytlík, "Doslov," an Afterword to Politické a sociální dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona by Jaroslav Hašek, Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 9, ed. Zdena Ančík et al. (Prague: 1963), p. 280.

[39]Elanskij, Gašek, p. 28.

[40]To categorize Hašek as a revolutionary before the war represents a problem because his nihilism is thus minimized. Vostokova considers that Hašek's satire was "sometimes nihilistic," which is in contrast with Šalda's statement that Hašek negated the world. Yet Vostokova also writes about Hašek's "uncompromising rejection of the bourgeois world." It seems that the Soviet scholar overlooks the historical fact that Czech society was bourgeois to such a degree that if Hašek is recognized as an uncompromising critic who rejected the bourgeois world, it means, essentially, the whole of Czech society. If Hašek rejected the bourgeois world completely, then Šalda's statement about Hašek's total negation is correct. This would mean that the Soviet critics would have to review either Hašek's rejection of bourgeois society or his nihilism. Czech Marxist critics go much further in accepting Hašek's nihilism than their Soviet colleagues, because otherwise his dadaism could not be explained. Pytlík, especially, feels strongly about Hašek's originality of pre-dadaist dadaism (Vostokova, Gašek, pp. 54, 179).

[41]Highet, Satire, p. 235. The misanthropic satirist is contemptuous of the world and hates people. His satire is here "not to cure, but to wound, to punish, to destroy." Hašek is usually compared to Gogol, but Cecil Parrott compares him to another misanthropic satirist, Jonathan Swift.

[42]Albert Camus, The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt, trans. Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 132.

[43]On the presence of "poshlost'" in Hašek's work, Soviet critics and Western scholars agree. However, Vostokova credits Hašek as its ardent critic while Robert Vlach observes that Hašek became its victim. (Vostokova, Gašek, p. 36; Robert Vlach, "Gogol and Hašek--Two Masters of Poshlost'," Etudes slaves et est-européennes 7 [Automne-Hiver 1962], p. 242).

## CHAPTER II

## THE CZECH LEGIONARY AND THE RED COMMISSAR

Hašek's political philosophy changed drastically as he witnessed the war and the revolutionary events in Russia between 1915 and 1920. He became a fervent Czech nationalist--at first supporting the tsarophile wing of the Czech community, the Kiev League, and later, after the February Revolution, he backed the republican program of T. G. Masaryk. Through his journalistic work, Hašek helped to establish the Czechoslovak revolutionary army (called the Legion)--a vital organization if Czechoslovakia was to come into existence. After the October Revolution, he rebelled against the leadership of the Legion and joined the Bolsheviks.

While Hašek's rebellion against the Legion was (and still is) considered treasonable by Czech nationalists, his decision is praised by Marxist critics. Because the role of the Czechoslovak Legion in Soviet history is perceived differently by West European historians and by Soviet scholars, Hašek's action is therefore also a source of dispute. However, despite the differences, all critics recognize that Hašek's sojourn in Russia proved to be an extremely important one, because Švejk (although written after Hašek's

return to Czechoslovakia) was inspired by this experience. How the events in Russia affected Hašek as a writer is fittingly assessed by Robert Pynsent, who wrote:

> The Russian period, when Hašek attacks others for that lack of seriousness which had hitherto been the hallmark of his own life, acted as a catalyst. It turned the literary prankster into a major novelist.[1]

Hašek's transformation from the pre-war bohemian nihilist into a serious, dedicated journalist fighting for the nationalist cause occurred in 1916 when Hašek joined Družina, the Russian Orthodox Church, and the tsarophile circle of Czech settlers living in Kiev. Describing his first encounter with Hašek in Russia, the Czech writer František Langer was surprised to see the former bohemian making patriotic speeches while recruiting among the Czech prisoners of war. Langer did not expect a patriotic outburst from a person such as Hašek, who despised any form of patriotism before the war.

The Czech Marxist literary historian Radko Pytlík compares Hašek of this period to the Czech national revivalists of the nineteenth century, because he worked for the national cause with enthusiasm. At the same time he criticized Hašek for exaggerated slavophilism, for "suppressing his journalistic instinct," and for "submission to the political leadership." In his view, Hašek's lack of pre-war "analytical scepticism" caused his propagandistic work to be full of "pathetical slogans and phrases from . . . the arsenal of patriotic politics."[2] The fact that Hašek asso-

ciated himself with the pro-tsarist group of the Czech community is explained by Radko Pytlík and Jaroslav Křížek as a form of compromise on Hašek's part in order to accelerate the military action against Austria-Hungary. According to the two critics, Hašek hated Franz Joseph's rule to such a degree that he wanted to fight against the monarchy as soon as possible. Because the establishment of a Czech army depended solely on the tsarist government, the only group which could achieve this was the Kiev League, which was on good terms with the Russian government. For this reason, Hašek accepted Russian citizenship and converted to Orthodox Christianity.[3]

Hašek's writings, created between the summer of 1916 and the spring of 1917, clearly indicate his pro-tsarist leanings. In the article What We Owe to the Russian Czechs (Čím jsme povinni ruským Čechům, September 1916) Hašek explains the prominent role of the Czech settlers in Russia in organizing the Czech voluntary army Družina, and he expresses gratitude for what they did to alleviate the predicament of the Czech prisoners of war:

> Those Czechs who came to Russia in whole battalions as prisoners of war felt helpless when the war broke out. . . .
> We threw away our arms but did nothing else. . . . It was the Russian Czechs who had presented to the involuntary emigrants a new vision of the political struggle. . . .
> . . . No one can deny that the foremost idea of the Russian Czechs was to organize armed resistance against Austria. . . .
> . . . Who founded the Czech army? Who informed the tsar about our aspirations for independence? Who supported financially our movement in its beginnings? Russian Czechs.
> And history will record justly what we owe to them. . .[4]

Hašek's articles of this period reveal a feeling of appreciation for the contributions of others, especially those of politicians. This is in contrast to the negative attitude of his pre-war work. Hašek was not only thankful to the slavophile and tsarophile Kiev League for the help offered to Czech soldiers but also enthusiastic about its political aspirations. In the article A Ruler Who Seats Himself on Czech Bayonets (Panovník, který se posadí na české bajonety, November 1916), Hašek makes a statement which seems incongruous in the light of his pre-war anarchism:

> We don't want to have a Habsburg on the Czech throne. We made the revolution in order to overthrow the Habsburg dynasty and call to the throne a member of the great Slav family of the Romanovs.[5]

Although it appears incomprehensible that Hašek would try to replace one, often satirized, dynasty by another one, this view was shared by many members of the Kiev League. However, the majority of the prisoners of war opposed the conservative policies of the Czech settlers and found the Petrograd liberal organization more congenial. This was despite the fact that the Russian government supported only the Kiev League.

Hašek tried to persuade the former Austrian soldiers of Czech nationality who were living in the prison camps to join Družina, but his task was difficult. A typical example of Hašek's propagandist efforts is The Fortunes of Mr. Hurt (Osudy pana Hurta, July 1916) wherein Hašek chides a prisoner of war for refusing to join the new army. Rather than fight,

Mr. Hurt chose to grow fat and remain inactive in the prison camp. In his indignation, Hašek refused to acknowledge the serious obstacles which the Czech soldiers faced: they were asked to fight for the state which did not yet exist; they were considered traitors by the Austrians (and Germans) and consequently hanged if caught participating in action against the Central Powers; there were reprisals against their families at home; moreover, many soldiers did not envisage a lucrative future under the tsar, whom they distrusted and thought undemocratic. The fact that the number of volunteers increased noticeably after the February Revolution proves that the tsarist government was the main deterrent, not the indifference of the Czech soldiers to the fate of their nation.

Hašek himself did not face the above dilemmas because he had joined the tsarophile wing readily and his anti-Habsburg stand was only intensified when he was charged with treason in absentia for insulting the emperor in The Story of the Portrait of Franz Joseph I (Povídka o obrazu císaře Františka Josefa I, July 1916).[6] However, there are indications that Hašek was aware of the problems which the prisoners of war encountered. In the story In the Tracks of the State Police in Prague (Po stopách státní policie v Praze, August 1916) he deals with infiltration of secret agents among the prisoners of war. This story portrays the shady character of a secret police agent, Alexander Mašek, whom Hašek knew from his anarchist days. At that time Mašek

was commissioned to penetrate the anarchist movement and neutralize its activities during the emperor's visit to Prague. The story stresses the unbridgeable differences between the Crown and the Czech nation:

> It was at the time when the Emperor Franz Joseph I was supposed to arrive in Prague in order to knock on the foundation stone of some bridge. When it came to the Czech question, the old monarch specialized exclusively in bridges. He arrived, knocked on the stone and remarked: "It is interesting that this bridge leads from one side to another," and added: "I am glad that you are Czechs." After such a visit the whole nation was always under the impression that this old gentleman was sclerotic.[7]

Besides his ironic treatment of the emperor's interest in the Czech problem, Hašek ridicules Franz Joseph's attempt to speak in Czech by having him mispronounced the word Češi (Czechs) and těší (glad). Hašek then depicts Mašek's activities among the anarchists before the war. Although the police spread the news that Mašek had died, Hašek ends the story by explaining that the police agent Mašek is alive and well, living in Russia, "interested in the Czech problem," that is, informing on the Czechs to the Austrian authorities. The real Mašek was indeed sent to Russia by police, pretending to be a prisoner of war, but thanks to Hašek's testimony his identity was revealed. He was shot by the legionaries for treason in 1918.

In addition to recurrent themes on the subject of the reluctance of many Czechs to join the revolutionary army and the sharp anti-Habsburg articles, Hašek wrote political commentaries in which he praised those who were already part of

this military force. In his Letters from the Front (Dopisy z fronty, September and October 1916) he commented proudly on the military exploits of the Czech soldiers against Austria-Hungary, called them fine lads (naši hoši), complimented them on their know-how and their resourcefulness when facing difficulties, and praised their friendly attitude toward local people. None of his pre-war anti-militarism penetrates his articles nor does he ridicule the army during the war.

Yet one would expect, on the basis of Hašek's pre-war work, also to find articles disparaging the Orthodox Church, but there is no evidence of such writings. Hašek rarely touched upon the church, and if he did, it was usually the Catholic Church of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, without ever referring to similar deficiencies in the Russian Orthodox Church. Moreover, Hašek did not discuss the role of the church even after the February Revolution and did not mind if the Czech soldiers converted to Orthodox Christianity, although this was not required any more in order to join the Legion. It seems that Hašek was willing to sacrifice his pre-war anti-clerical sentiments in order to establish a Czech army.[8]

Although the Marxist scholars try to explain Hašek's pro-tsarist stand at that time as a means to further his nationalist aims, it can be also assumed that his conversion to the Orthodox religion was genuine on his part and not only an act of opportunism in order to promote the estab-

lishment of the Czech army. His conversion would better explain his association with the slavophile Kiev League and his support of it even after the February Revolution. This would also clarify why Hašek did not protest against the conversion of the Czech prisoners of war and why it took Hašek so long to join the democratic forces of the independence movement. Finally, this notion would better explain why Hašek, if he had converted in good faith, could not satirize what he believed in. Once he became a Communist and a member of the Red Army, he and the church were again at odds, which is an ideal situation for a satirist.

The February Revolution terminated Hašek's pro-tsarist period but not his personal preference for the Kiev League. Before the arrival of Masaryk in Russia, he vehemently backed the slavophile Deputy Dŭrich with his pro-tsarist plans. In March of 1917 his articles reveal that he changed his views and supported Masaryk's republican aspirations and his vision of a large Czechoslovak army. The establishment of the military organization proved to be a difficult task at first, because Prime Minister Kerensky was as uncooperative as the government of Nicholas II: he considered the Czech prisoners of war traitors to their emperor and their government. Kerensky changed his low opinion of the Czech soldiers when the Russian front began to disintegrate while the Czechs proved their willingness to fight during the July offensive of 1917. He then agreed to establish the army on a large scale.

Hašek continued to contribute to Čechoslovan, writing commentaries on contemporary subjects such as Dark Force (Temná síla, March 1917) about Rasputin, or explaining the republican aims of the Czechs as in The Republican Program in the Czech Lands (Republikánský program v Čechách, March 1917). Hašek's anarchism is also evident in his pro-Masaryk period. He was interested in the Russian terrorist movement and admired its heroes.

There were serious disagreements among the members of the independence movement by the time the Congress of Czechs living in Russia was convened. The Czech community was by now largely composed of former prisoners of war and legionaries. The original founders of the organization, the settlers, realized that they could not be voted in as they had been before the year 1917 and that the Petrograd group would represent the Czechs in Russia. Politically, the Kiev League lost its influence after the February Revolution and the abdication of Nicholas II, and officially, after the election in May of 1917.

Hašek, who was committed to a lost cause, wrote several articles against the Petrograd organization and one of them, The Czech Pickwick Club (Klub českých Pickwiků, April 1917) caused his release from Čechoslovan. In this literary piece Hašek was, as he had been before the war, a satirist whose role is to attack and to ridicule. He wanted to prove his point that the political leaders of the Petrograd group were undistinguished amateurs, although some of them later became

representatives of the Czechoslovak government. Hašek attacked the main leader of the organization, Bohdan Pavlů, describing him as "the friend of the well-known German-Austrian spy Baron von Schelking," and portrayed Chalupa, the President of the Club of Associates (as the prisoners of war organization was known), as a parochial judge who behaved like all other court officials from a small town who:

> . . . in the morning pass sentences on paupers and in the afternoon immerse themselves in their hobbies. They photograph, paint, play-act, go on shoots, drink their few glasses of beer a day, tell their usual stories, but remain mere dilettantes all their lives. For them, everything is just a game. The only thing they really care about is that they should be mentioned in society, even if only attending a funeral. There was a time when their name never carried further than across the boundaries of a couple of districts, but now that they have no one above them they try to spread it as far as possible. . . All they want is that the bill stickers from the Club--I mean the Czech Pickwick Club--should post up their names on their placards.[9]

This article demonstrates Hašek's pre-war attitude toward politicians and is as sharp as his satire published before 1914. It shows also his irresponsibility at the time when Czechs were required to unite. Moreover, he timed it to achieve the most effect from the point of view of causing harm because the day of the publication happened to be 23 April 1917--the election day of the Third Congress of Czechs and Slovaks in Russia. Notwithstanding the fact that the Kiev League lost and the Petrograd group gained the majority of the votes, Hašek directed his satire against the Petrograd organization from a position of a conservative tsarophile.

Hašek was not allowed to publish in the legionary press for four months and was sent to the front. In spite of all disagreements, his writings appeared again in Čechoslovan after the last offensive fought by the Russian army in July 1917. Hašek, who later deserted the Legion, was also the author of a moving report about the battle of Zborów (Tarnopol), which described the disintegration of the Russian front and the feelings of the Czech soldiers, heroically fighting the Germans and Austrians while the Russian soldiers were running away. Hašek wrote in The Letter from the Front (Dopis z fronty, August 1917):

> Will one ever find a psychologist who could explain what was going on in the souls of the soldiers of those regiments, who left the trenches, threw away their rifles into a rye field and went to plunder the rear warehouses of clothes, sugar, and tobacco . . . undisturbed by leaving their positions in columns, not caring at all that their friends were still holding some of the positions, and who, after this exodus, would be surrounded by waves of Germans and Austrians; that they stood there like isolated little islands, resisting the superior numbers of enemies, abandoned by all, without hope of support.[10]

Further in The Letter, Hašek explained that the crumbling of the Russian front on July 5 was directly connected with the Bolshevik demonstrations in Petrograd and their anti-war propaganda. He also blamed the failure of the offensive on "the traitors bribed by German gold" by which he meant Lenin and his associates, and he referred to the subsequent counter-offensive of the Central Powers as "a mutually prepared war plan of the German-Austrian High Command and Lenin's circle."[11]

In spite of the fact that the July offensive of 1917 was not successful in halting the demoralization of the Russian army and the fall of the Eastern front, the Czechs fought well, broke into the Austrian positions and captured several thousand soldiers. This resulted in better understanding between Kerensky's government and the Czech leaders. The battle of Zborów boosted the morale of the Czechoslovak army, and in the West the European governments realized the seriousness of the commitment of the Czechs to the cause of independence and their reliability when fighting on the Allied side. Consequently, the Czechoslovak Council in Paris was acknowledged as the official representative organization of Czechs and Slovaks in exile. Then the volunteer army units were turned into regular army units. Hašek bitterly opposed this and it constituted one of the reasons for his eventual desertion from the Legion.

Hašek continued to follow the Legion's policies until the end of 1917. He remained anti-Soviet because the Brest-Litovsk negotiations for a separate peace between Russia and Germany proved to be disastrous for the Czech troops. The Czechs were officially at war with Germany, yet the Eastern front and the Russian army, of which they were part, did not exist. Moreover, in order to reach the Western front they would have to cross the territory occupied by Germans and Austrians, and they could not return to the Austro-Hungarian Empire as long as it existed for fear of reprisals against them. Thus, the only available solution seemed to be the

Siberian route.

The chaotic times were further aggravated by the Social Democratic organization which was set apart from other Czech groups and led by two radicals, Muna and Hais. Although it was anti-Bolshevik at first and changed to a pro-Soviet organization later, this association was consistently anti-legionary. Hašek sharply criticized the attitude of Muna and Hais and their newspaper Svoboda. Since they believed in internationalism, they were sceptical about the revolutionary plan of the Czechs to overthrow the Austrian government, keeping thus many potential volunteers, who were organized in the Social Democratic Party, away from the Legion. In The Languid Decadence (Slabošská dekadence, November 1917) Hašek described the fictitious character Mr. Teplický who wants to wait things out and is happy that the official policy of the Social Democratic Party is against his joining the Legion because he is really a coward:

> And so he [Mr. Teplický] puts his last hopes into Svoboda. But I assume that Svoboda did not say its last word yet. . .
>
> I hope firmly that our colleague, comrade Hais, will write in Svoboda: "Every organized comrade has to join the Czech army!"
>
> And then Mr. Teplický will say: "But you are mistaken, I am not an organized comrade . . . I am not a man at all, I am a coward."[12]

Although Hašek and Muna put aside their differences temporarily in February 1918, when the putsch against the leadership of the Legion was attempted, the leftists were never to forgive Hašek his attacks and made his initial Communist career extremely difficult.

In January 1918 Hašek began to discuss socialism in his writings as he was evidently influenced by the social impact of the October Revolution. In February, when the Red Army was in direct contact with the Legion in Kiev, the class struggle appears to be a paramount motif in his article. The Prague Castle and the Look-out Tower Continue in Their Conversation (Hradčany s rozhlednou pokračují v rozmluvě, February 1918):

> . . . "Far and wide into the countryside I see villages and cities. From them the red flags of revolution arise from the misty screen. The working people are marching to create a new fatherland. . . . The sun rises in the East. . ."[13]

The change in Hašek's terminology is obvious from the text. At this point Hašek comes full circle, now that socialism emerges again as his credo. It was only a matter of time before political events allowed him to follow his new revolutionary aspirations, and these events were quick to come. The Legion was forced to evacuate Kiev in order to escape the German army which was advancing into the Ukraine. Once Masaryk proclaimed the Legion as a part of the French army, French military discipline was introduced and the route to Vladivostok agreed upon. Hašek opposed these changes. However, his motivation to help Russia against Germany did not spring from strong pro-Bolshevik sympathies on his part but from his slavophilism.[14] Hašek wanted the Legion to remain in Russia to fight the Germans and so did the Czech leftists and the Soviet government. In order to attract a large body of soldiers, the Czech radical Social Democrats,

now openly propagating Communist principles, used Masaryk's name in their propaganda articles, claiming that he was the head of the newly-established revolutionary council. Hašek was expressing the same sentiments and wrote for Zprávy (The News, February 1918) the following:

> To All Soldiers!
>
> The armies of the German and Austrian emperors invaded the Ukraine and Russia. They are the vanguard of the capitalists and imperialists who sent them against the political and social revolution, against the Russian and Czech proletariat. Instead of acting resolutely the military committee showed despondency. . . . But the Czechoslovak revolutionary council of workers and soldiers was formed with professor Masaryk at the head, which calls up all Czechs and Slovaks to arms. . . . Your duty, soldiers, is not to lose courage and violate discipline. Check your ranks in order that nobody spreads false news among you. Arm yourselves with firm confidence in the Czechoslovak revolutionary council of workers and soldiers led by professor Masaryk.[15]

Jaroslav Křížek points out that the text shows a turning point from Hašek's former nationalist view into a correct evaluation of class internationalism.[16] However, Hašek demonstrated irresponsibility as a journalist because he tried to delude the soldiers about the revolutionary council and Masaryk's position in it. It may well be that Hašek was misinformed (as were some right-wing Social Democrats), nevertheless he betrayed the trust of the soldiers who enjoyed his articles during the war.

The transformation from a former Austrian soldier into a Czech Communist was now complete, and subsequent political events proved to Hašek that there was no way back. He arrived where one would expect him to be from the very

beginning of the war--the radical left wing. Hašek wrote several pieces during his collaboration with the Czech leftist newspaper Průkopník that were related to the political and social changes around him, but he no longer had an impact on the course of events. He tried to stop the Legion from going to France and published an article Why Are We Leaving for France? (Proč se jede do Francie?, March 1918) in which he emphasized the importance of helping the Russian nation and claimed that the October Revolution would eventually effect the liberation of the Czech people.

In the same tone Hašek wrote one of his last propagandist articles To Professor Masaryk! (Prof. Masarykovi!, May 1918) in which he again called for the change of course needed in order to retain the Legion in Russia. Hašek accused the Petrograd Branch of the National Council of "petty bourgeois thinking," because the Czech politicians failed to see the importance of the October Revolution and tried to separate the Czech national revolution from the world revolution. This Hašek considered to be a grave mistake and betrayal of the world revolution. In his view it would be a cowardly act for the Legion to leave. Although Hašek evidently embraced the idea of world revolution as a Communist, his accusations against Masaryk and Masaryk's policies are made from the position of an embittered defendant of the Kiev League. He reproached Masaryk for taking over the troops while the hard work had been done by the Czech settlers in Russia from the very beginning of the war.

He minimized the political blunders of Dürich and accused the pro-Masaryk group of slandering the tsarophile politician. Moreover, he attacked "the infamous neutrality" as a ridiculous gesture in "a world stricken by economical, political, and moral problems."

Hašek's bitterness, which permeates the article, is understandable as he happened to be on the losing side when the fate of the liberation movement was being decided. However, his feelings are not a good substitute for the political realities and historical facts. Hašek refused to admit that without Masaryk, there would hardly be a successful revolution against the monarchy. As he lived only in Russia during the war, he did not realize that Czech émigré groups lived also in Western Europe and the United States, helping the revolutionary movement financially. They would not agree to the establishment of a Czechoslovakia under the Romanovs or Russian influence. Moreover, France and England recognized Masaryk's cause, while the Russian government refused to organize a Czech army. Because the European governments were more responsive, the National Council made the decision to transfer the fighting force from Russia to France a long time before the October Revolution, and thus it was not a capricious change on Masaryk's part. In addition, the Legion was supposed to stay in Russia only under one condition--if the Eastern front did not collapse. As it did, due to Bolshevik pacifist policies and the general demoralization of the

Russian army which Masaryk had observed before the October Revolution, the initial plan to move the Legion as agreed earlier was put into motion.

The same can be said on the subject of neutrality, which Masaryk proclaimed a long time before the Bolshevik take-over. Ironically, at first, the presence of former Austrian soldiers organized on Russian soil in order to fight the Germans was an embarrassing fact for the Soviet government when the Brest-Litovsk negotiations were in process. The Soviets agreed to remove the Legion under the condition of disarmament, of which the Czechs approved; but once Trotsky became War Commissar, the originally cooperative policy toward the Legion was changed to a policy of heavy harassment.[17]

Hašek had to be aware of some problems, as he appeared to be anxious about the fate of the Legion in Samara, where he was sent to work as a Red Army recruiter in April 1918. He was reprimanded by his Communist colleagues in Moscow for being too friendly with the troops and his Communist credibility was seriously questioned. When the Legion occupied Samara, Hašek was asked by the Soviet officials to negotiate, but he refused, afraid for his life, and later left his Red Army unit which was moved towards Buzuluk. But Hašek followed the north-eastern route on his own. Apparently his desertion from the Red Army was not considered a grave mistake at that time by the Soviet authorities. However, once the Red Army voluntary system

was substituted by the strict military discipline, the attitude toward deserters also changed--after August 1918 they were shot.

By now, political associations often meant the difference between life and death. Hašek was in an unenviable situation: as an ex-Austrian deserter he would be hanged if caught by the Germans; as a former Red Army recruiter, he was considered a traitor by the Legion, which issued a warrant for his arrest, and he could not return to Austria-Hungary for his active part in the independence movement. Yet he survived, wandering through Russia, pretending to be an idiotic son of a German merchant.[18] There is little known about Hašek between the summer and winter of 1918; only that he became a Soviet official in the town of Bugulma.[19]

Hašek was published for the first time in the Soviet press in January 1919. The circumstances had changed drastically for him as he had begun to work for the Soviets in Siberia. He was needed, because significant numbers of units in the Red Army were composed of foreigners, especially former German and Hungarian prisoners of war who were now fighting as the Internationalists. Once again, Hašek's experience as a journalist was appreciated. At this point, Hašek wrote his <u>feuilletons</u> based on political and social changes around him as they were directly related to the Civil War and the consolidation process of Soviet power. He attacked enemies of the Soviet regime, espe-

cially the bourgeoisie and the clergy, invectively denouncing speculators and provocateurs of the war years. In addition, he wrote political commentaries which, in Křížek's view, Hašek composed "as a man who profoundly penetrated all the problems of contemporary Russia, and as a convinced Bolshevik with a broad political outlook."[20]

In the satirical article From the Diary of an Ufa Bourgeois (Iz dnevnika ufimskogo buržuja, January 1919), written for the Red Army newspaper, Hašek portrayed the hideous stereotype of a well-fed anti-Soviet member of the middle class, who exaggerates the military successes of the White armies and distorts the truth about the actions of the Bolsheviks. That character's comment was:

> I ate a little bit of ham yesterday, and in the evening a telegram came that Samara had fallen . . . . The number of fugitives is increasing. They say that the Bolsheviks slaughter all to a man . . .
> One staff-captain recounted . . . that the Bolsheviks pour boiling water over the bourgeois, they broil hamburgers made from their wives and children . . . They undress aristocrats and factory owners, boil them in special machines, then they add the scraped bones of the wives . . . in order to produce from it valenki for the Red Army.[21]

Hašek's hint about the piece of ham must have hit the target because it incited hate in the Red soldiers at the time of famine; but his attempt to exaggerate the cruelties of the Civil War to achieve a grotesque effect is unsuccessful. Horrifying experiences, such as wars, murders, and torture, can be retold as tragedy, but satire is "impotent" against them.[2] Hašek tried to make the horrors of the Civil War laughable by exaggeration, but they remained painful none-

theless. His writings were popular and kept the morale of the Red Army soldiers high, and yet in this manner Hašek licensed the destructiveness of Soviet forces because anything the soldiers did paled in comparison with these exaggerations.

In contrast to Hašek's tsarophile period, his writings at this time overflowed with virulent attacks against the clergy who were, in his view, the main supporters of the exploiting class and of the anti-Soviet forces. One of his more original and interesting articles is Christ and the Priests (Xristos i popy, March 1919), published as Hašek wrote it, although the editors of Naš put' did not agree with Hašek's evaluation of Christianity as early Communism. Hašek used historical sources to prove that the church was always on the side of the exploiters and that it misused Christ's original teachings about equality in order to brainwash the masses:

> Christianity was not the church, it used to be a commune of those who believed in revolutionary ideals of Christ-the-man.
>
> From Christ-the-God and from Christianity, the priests created the governing church. They tried their best so that the revolutionary tendency of the Gospel would disappear.
>
> They created the gospel of slavery from the gospel of revolution. They succeeded in changing Christ-the-revolutionary into a poor, humble God, whose revolutionary message was transformed into a legacy of passivity and submission to the governing classes.[23]

This article seems to be the most important of Hašek's Siberian period because it is entirely different from all the written propagandistic material. Apparently Hašek

tried to sever his ties with the church completely and to prove to himself that his choice of the gospel of the revolution was a correct one. He envisaged a classless society and equality of people through the revolution, not by means of religious beliefs.

Stories in which Hašek elaborated upon the problems of speculators and provacateurs have nothing in common with traditional Christianity or with Hašek's pre-war tolerant attitude towards the criminals. In About Greengrocer Bulakulin, the Ufa Thief (Ob ufimskom razbojnike lavočnike Bulakuline, March 1919) a type of speculator is depicted. Bulakulin, a despicable character, robs ordinary citizens by selling food and articles necessary for daily life for astronomical prices:

> . . . Greengrocer Bulakulin was especially delighted when somebody asked him if he had any matches. His first answer was the most uncomforting.
>
> "Even if you made kindling out of me you would not find any matches. It's not worth it to sell them because their price is too high. I, myself, bought them for a hundred and twenty rubles."
>
> But he had hidden two cases of them in his warehouse from the time when a box of matches was one kopeck.
>
> "If you want, I can give them to you," continues the bloodsucker, "one box for twelve rubles."[24]

Even before his execution for speculating, Bulakulin contemplates whether he should have sold sausage for a higher price. Speculating with food and basic necessities was punished by the death penalty during the time of the Red terror, and Hašek indicates that by his behaviour Bulakulin only confirms the correctness of the penalty.

Similarly, the ruthlessness of the existing regime, as the social changes were taking place in Siberia, is demonstrated in the article Ivan Ivanovič from Ufa (Ufimskij Ivan Ivanovič, February 1919). Hašek fumes over the arrogance of the provocateur who "misuses freedom of speech" in order to spread lies about the Soviet and White armies, thus undermining the Soviet regime:

> He comes to the market and talks with merchants, looking like a man who is interested in cabbage, flour, meat, and lard.
>
> "Well," says he, observing a suckling pig, "Bugulma was taken back by the Whites and this is the reason why leaving for Simbirsk is forbidden."
>
> He knows the psychology of the merchants, that dark mass of petty bourgeoisie and village kulaks who believe all idiotic rumours, as long as it means something unpleasant for the Soviets.
>
> "Glory to you, Sir," says a little old woman, who was listening, and she runs home in order to spread further . . . the idiotic ideas of Ivan Ivanovic.[25]

Since he was under the impression that capital punishment by hanging had been abolished, Hašek recommends shooting these anti-Soviet enemies like Ivan Ivanovič instead:

> Today you hear that Birsk was taken, tomorrow Sterlitamak, and you don't know what to do: either to laugh at the idiots, or to take a revolver and blow out their brains.
>
> The latter, in my opinion, is the best way of fighting provacateurs.
>
> At the time of the French Revolution, they did not use the guillotine but they hanged them.
>
> Taking into consideration that the death penalty by hanging was abolished, I propose to shoot on the spot all provocateurs such as Ivan Ivanovic.[26]

The story not only shows Hašek's revolutionary zest and his unrelenting stand against politically erring individuals but also his propagandistic fervour. The rumours of

the provocateur were not entirely unfounded because in March 1919 the army of Admiral Kolchak occupied Ufa temporarily.

The deadly endings, a sure sign of the violence of the Civil War, are not an entirely new element in Hašek's work. He often terminated grotesque stories in a similar manner before the war. However, there is a difference between the artist's imagination and application in real life. Hašek is absolutely serious here, although he is known to have avoided bloody reprisals personally and, according to his Russian wife, never shot anyone.[27] Radko Pytlík refers to an episode confirming Hašek's humane behaviour. Hašek saved the life of a Czech legionary Vladimír Brikcius who was denounced by a Red Army soldier - a former legionary. Brikcius was not only taken out of prison but, thanks to Hašek's interference, also obtained travelling papers and returned to Czechoslovakia without any difficulties.[28] Although Hašek's behaviour is commendable, he has to be judged on the basis of his writings alone. Even if he was not cruel, he demanded the strictest punishments in his articles, thus supporting the cruelties of the regime. But the Brikcius case is interesting for another reason. It reveals more about Hašek, the exemplary commissar. He has to be admired for saving a human life; yet it was the former legionary, who had denounced Brikcius, who behaved correctly toward the enemy of the revolution, not Hašek.

In addition to the articles about anti-revolutionary class enemies, Hašek also published many political commentaries, frequently discussing the events in Germany, Hungary, or Czechoslovakia. Their style and content demonstrate that Hašek viewed the world from the position of a convinced Bolshevik, but they also reveal that Hašek was either misinformed or misinforming. The article What Will Happen to the Czechoslovak Bourgeois Republic (Čto stanet s Čexoslovackoj buržuaznoj respublikoj, January 1920), which exemplifies Hašek's view of his home country, shows how he perceived the events as a high-ranking Red Army man. He informed his readers that Czechoslovakia had betrayed the revolution because of Masaryk, "a president nominated by France," and because of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party who were collaborating with the bourgeois government, while the demonstrations staged by the proletariat were cruelly repressed. Then he further went on to say that the jails were full of workers, French and British capitalists had completely swallowed up Czech resources, and the workers' productivity had gone down, resulting in an extremely aggravated economic situation. At the end, Hašek is hopeful about the Communist future of Czechoslovakia:

> Intrigues and violence of the imperialism of the Allies, treason of the leaders--so-called "socialist" ministers--all that gives only new nourishment for spreading the flame. . . . In Plzeň, Liberec, and Brno factories stopped. The sentimental national anthem "Where is my homeland?" was exchanged for the "Internationale." The Czechoslovak bourgeois Republic

> is approaching its downfall. President Masaryk sits on a volcano.
>
> Soon the bourgeois republic will be overtaken by mortal shock . . . . And what is in store for the Czechoslovak bourgeois republic? It will become a Soviet Republic!

Hašek wrote this article about a country he had not seen for years and drew conclusions from second-hand information. On the contrary, Czechoslovakia made a fast recovery and productivity was kept high, because the workers, instead of being in jail, were working in industries. As for President Masaryk, "nominated by France," he remained "sitting on the volcano" for another fifteen years, democratically voted into office by the Czech nation.

Hašek wrote more articles which show similar factual discrepancies but there are no articles which would demonstrate that Hašek did not follow the party line. There are no indications that Hašek ever wrote critical articles about the Soviet regime or that he created literary pieces other than the propagandistic writings. However, one source maintains that Hašek wrote in Irkutsk yet another version of Švejk, Švejk in the Country of Bolsheviks (Švejk v zemi bolševiků).[30] Whether the book was critical or not cannot be determined because the manuscript was never found.

If Hašek was a controversial figure before the war, the Russian pre-October period of his life is even more controversial. Hašek changed from a negativist rebel into a proclaimed Christian with revolutionary ideals. He took

his vocation as a journalist seriously and worked for public good. After the October Revolution, due to his irrepressible subversiveness and a belief that socialist revolution would solve the problems of mankind better than the Czech local one, he rebelled against the leadership of the Legion and became a Marxist revolutionary.

Although the two politically contradictory periods of Hašek's sojourn in Russia are usually examined in order to demonstrate the ideological differences between Hašek-the-nationalist and Hašek-the-Communist, in essence they share many similarities. Pytlík's view of Hašek's uncritical stand for the tsarophile League and his submission to its political goals, which is mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, can be applied throughout his Red Army career as well. As a commissar, Hašek also suppressed his journalistic instinct, uncritically followed the official line of the Soviet government, and his articles overflow with revolutionary party propaganda instead of nationalism. In both instances, Hašek became an engagé journalist (in addition to his conversion, the greatest contrast to the pre-war bohemian writer), subjugating his artistic talent and individualism in order to serve the ruling party and distorting the truth for the sake of ideological victories: nationalist in the first case, and socialist in the second. There is a tendency in his writings to exaggerate during the legionary stage, while during the Soviet period, his commentaries are often simply untrue. Yet as a nationalist

and as a Communist, Hašek became seriously engaged in both tasks.

However, the two ideologically contradictory periods are examined by literary critics not for their similarities but for their differences. The Siberian phase of Hašek's life is highly acclaimed by Soviet critics. S. Vostokova ranks Hašek's satire with writings of Bedny and Mayakovsky and puts emphasis on the fact that Hašek as a propagandist never stopped being an artist.[31] On the other hand, Soviet scholars downplay the importance of Hašek's nationalist period and they question his sincerity. Vostokova maintains that Hašek's pro-tsarist articles did not necessarily mean that he was a convinced tsarophile.[32] N.P. Elanskij goes further in asserting that Hašek hid his true feelings and tempered his revolutionary sympathies.[33] However, if Hašek's sincerity during this phase of his life is questioned, by the same token one can doubt Hašek's candour during his Red Army career.

There are literary critics who do not see Hašek as an outstanding artist and consider his literary output of poor quality.[34] Radko Pytlík also offers more severe criticism of Hašek's work created after the October Revolution. Hašek may have been an indispensable organizer and devoted journalist, but he failed as a literary artist. He could channel his artistic inspiration only into one direction--either to aid the revolution by writing propagandistic articles or to concentrate fully on his creative writing; and evi-

dently, Hašek followed the first alternative.[35] The articles presented here do support Pytlík's conclusion. It seems that Hašek, as in his anarchist phase, was unable to combine literary quality with a political message. Moreover, he did not create a specific revolutionary character despite the fact that he himself experienced two revolutionary stages while in Russia.

Interestingly, it is not Hašek's Red Army career which represents the greatest change in his life. The change into a Marxist revolutionary was not as radical as his change from a pre-war rebel into a nationalist with Christian beliefs. Although the October Revolution had an enormous impact on the world, it is to be emphasized that the Czech liberation movement culminated also in a social revolution and was just as important to the Czechs and Slovaks as was the October Revolution to the Bolsheviks. The Czech revolution was not a bloody affair yet it required an excellent political program, a military organization, a sense of unity on the part of the nation, and sacrifices from many Czech and Slovak patriots, especially soldiers fighting in Russia. This is the reason why Hašek's desertion was felt so keenly by the legionaries and why he was considered a traitor. But Hašek's rebelliousness proved to be dormant only temporarily because the change from Czech voluntary units into a regular military organization turned Hašek again into a rebel, and the legionary sources acknowledge the difficulties with Hašek.

According to the Soviet sources, Hašek never caused disciplinary difficulties during his career as a Red Army commissar. His writings, as they appear in Czech and Soviet editions of his work, offer no proof of political deviations and are clearly written by "a convinced Bolshevik." However, several Czech sources mention that Hašek is said to have found the Soviet regime less to his liking after the first revolutionary period was followed by the strict measures of the consolidating stage.[36] Radko Pytlík also refers to the political conditions in Siberia and points out that Hašek did not notice the change from the destructive stage to the consolidating period of Soviet power, when "mass enthusiasm was replaced by administrative measures" and "the atmosphere of trust by suspicion."[37]

If this assumption is correct, then Hašek ironically faced the same dilemma as he had done earlier in the Legion, when the revolutionary army had been transformed into a military machine. At that time, he had voiced his protest and consequently left. However, it may well be, as Pytlík maintains, that Hašek did not indeed notice the changes in the Soviet system and thus cannot be accused of any conscious ideological mistakes. Then it can be assumed that the root of Hašek's problems lay in the changes of Soviet policies. It is a known fact that the Eighth Party Congress (1919) recognized the important role of the commissars in the Red Army, but their status became controversial a year later when the Civil War was over and Trotsky proposed to

minimize their position. He also planned to change the regular centralized army into the territorial militia. The Soviet military strongly opposed the move and Trotsky was later removed from his position as People's Commissar of War.[38]

It seems quite improbable that Hašek, being a political commissar, would be able to avoid all friction and find his position unshakeable. Moreover, he was a foreigner, a former legionary, a former anarchist, and a former deserter from the Red Army. Once his work for the Internationalists was done and the Red Army managed to train its own specialists, he was not needed any more. Even if his record as a Red Army commissar was flawless, his anarchist past had to make him suspicious at a time when anarchists were on the blacklist.

In addition, the Brikcius case demonstrates that Hašek did not follow the laws of revolution to the extreme and rebelled against them by saving a human life.[39] However, judged on the basis of his writings alone, Hašek remained a revolutionary throughout his Red Army career.

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1]Pynsent, "Last Days of Austria," p. 138.

[2]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 269.

[3]Ibid, p. 271; Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, pp. 80, 85.

[4]Jaroslav Hašek, Dobrý voják Švejk v zajetí: Stati a humoresky z dob války, Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vols. 13-14, ed. Zdena Ančík et al. (Prague: 1973), p. 115.

[5]Ibid, p. 127.

[6]Another example of Hašek's anti-Habsburg writing is a second version of Švejk published under the title The Good Soldier Švejk in Captivity (Dobrý voják Švejk v zajetí, May 1917). The nationalist slogans which are later satirized in the novel are meant seriously, as is the final scene in which Švejk kills by mistake his German officer Dauerling and goes to the Russians. Švejk of the final version would never kill Dauerling.

[7]Hašek, Švejk v zajetí, p. 96.

[8]Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, pp. 79-80.

[9]Parrott, Bad Bohemian, p. 170. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[10]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 287.

[11]Křížek, Hašek v. Rusku, pp. 114-15.

[12]Hašek, Švejk v zajetí, p. 206.

[13]Ibid, p. 271.

[14]Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, p. 134.

[15]Hašek, Švejk v zajetí, p. 359.

[16]Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, p. 166.

[17]The neutrality was first announced by Masaryk on 31 May 1917 in order reassure the Provisional Government and especially the pacifist Bolshevik faction that the

Czechs would not interfere in Russia's internal affairs. On 31 August 1917 Masaryk confirmed that the French government would finance the Legion. This was to the great relief of the Czech leadership because the Legion was no longer dependent on the Russian government. However, the fact was not confirmed officially until January 1918. Meanwhile, the Ukrainian Rada came into existence. As the Legion was stationed near Kiev, Masaryk agreed with the employment of the troops in case of anarchy, but on the premise that peace with Germany would annul the agreement. This eventually happened, and Masaryk decided to evacuate the Legion as soon as possible. The first troops to be sent to France reached Archangel already in October 1917. In February 1918 Masaryk signed an agreement with Red Army Commander Muraviev in Kiev, who also favoured neutrality and let the Legion leave. However, when Trotsky became Commissar of War in March 1918, he gave orders to stop the trains in Penza and disarm Czechs completely. The Czechs had already surrendered eighty percent of their arms as a friendly gesture because they expected to be re-armed in France and their route to Vladivostok was planned to be completed by the end of May. Although the Legion was part of the Allied forces, the Soviet government never recognized the fact officially and Trotsky hoped to use their former status as soldiers of the Russian Imperial Army to his advantage. The Czechs were rightly suspicious of the dealings between the Czech Communists and the Soviets. The Moscow office of the National Council was occupied and the leaders imprisoned in May 1918 while the Congress of the Communist Party (25 May 1918) was acknowledged by the Soviet government as the only representative body of the Czechs in Russia and was given the responsibility for the affairs of all Czech citizens on Russian soil. Soon afterwards, hostilities broke out when the legionaries realized that they were trapped and the trains were not allowed to move. Their aversion for the Soviet government was only intensified when they faced Red Army units composed mostly of former German and Hungarian prisoners of war (not Russian peasants or workers but the Internationalists). One of the units which they had to fight near Lipjagi and Buzuluk was the one formed by Hašek from Czech and Slovak Communists. Hašek's articles about the necessity of keeping the Legion in Russia after March 1918 were illogical because the Soviet government had already signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty with Germany.

[18]After his return to Czechoslovakia, Hašek described some of his adventures of this period in an unfinished sketch, The Jubilee Reminiscense (Jubilejní vzpomínka).

[19]This period of his life was also described later by Hašek after his return to Czechoslovakia. Because the short stories about Bugulma were not written during his Red Army

career in the Soviet Union, they are introduced in the last chapter of this thesis.

[20]Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, p. 250.

[21]Jaroslav Gašek, Sočinenija Jaroslava Gaška v piati tomax, vol. 5: Rasskazy, stat'i fel'etony, ed. P. L. Bogatyrev (Moscow: 1966), p. 155.

[22]Highet, Satire, pp. 22-23.

[23]Jaroslav Hašek, Velitelem města Bugulmy: Z tajemství mého pobytu v Rusku, Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 15, ed. Zdena Ančík et al. (Prague: 1966), p. 41.

[24]Gašek, Sočinenija, pp. 169-70.

[25]Ibid, p. 161.

[26]Ibid, p. 162.

[27]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 319. Cecil Parrott makes an interesting comparison between Hašek and his aversion towards the death penalty when he points out the same trait in the behaviour of the greatest saint of Bohemia, St. Wenceslas (sv. Václav) who left the premises when the death penalty was announced and he, as a Duke of Bohemia, had to agree to it. (Parrott, Bad Bohemian, p. 204.)

[28]Pytlík, Toulavé house, pp. 329-31.

[29]Gašek, Sočinenija, p. 186.

[30]Jan Beneš, "Netrpělivý člověk pravoslavný," a Foreword to Velitelem města Bugulmy by Jaroslav Hašek (Toronto: Sixty-eight Publishers, 1976), p. 23.

[31]Vostokova, Gašek, pp. 113, 115.

[32]Ibid, p. 65.

[33]N.P. Elanskij, Jaroslav Gašek v revoljucionnoj Rossii (Moscow: 1960), p. 67. Hašek's mordant satire, The Czech Pickwick Club, against the Petrograd leadership demonstrates that Hašek was a conservative who did not hide his true feelings, because the work was published after the tsar's abdication when Hašek could freely express his liberal views, if he had any.

[34]Parrott, Study, p. 68; Součková, Satellite, p. 36.

[35]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 324. Radko Pytlík rewrote Toulavé house for the occasion of Hašek's anniversary in

1983. The book was published under the title Zpráva o Jaroslavu Haškovi. However, Pytlík was criticized in Rudé právo (25 June 1983) for the conclusion that Hašek was not able to create due to his Red Army work and responsibilities.

[36]Beneš, "Člověk pravoslavný," p. 23; Sauer and Suk, In memoriam, p. 34.

[37]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 327.

[38]Roman Kolkowicz, The Soviet Military and the Communist Party (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 41-45.

[39]Camus, Rebel, p. 218. The Brikcius case reveals that Hašek came to the same conclusion as the protagonist of Rebel: one cannot go along with the revolution forever because otherwise one could become either "an oppressor" or "a heretic."

## CHAPTER III

## HAŠEK LOOKS BACK AT RUSSIA

While Hašek was defending War Communism in Soviet Russia which was going through the stage of violent civil war, Czechoslovakia was also undergoing social and political changes. These changes however were not as drastic and turbulent as the historical events in Russia which Hašek witnessed. From the ruins of Austria-Hungary a new state emerged, Czechoslovakia, which was based on Western democracy and capitalism. By obtaining their independence, the Czechs gained more from the war than misery and starvation and were thus more optimistic about their future than some other European nations. Czech society remained firmly bourgeois, but the political position of the bourgeoisie improved from being the governed to being the governors. This is the main reason why the attempted Communist take-over in 1920 was unsuccessful. The Czechs were deeply troubled by the revolutions in Germany and Hungary. Moreover, they were suspicious of the Soviet government, due to the direct engagement between the Bolsheviks and the Legion. The anti-Soviet feeling was further stimulated by the plight of many Russian refugees who settled in Czechoslovakia.

The Communist <u>putsch</u> had been liquidated shortly

before Hašek's return to Czechoslovakia. Hašek himself was sent to Kladno (where Muna and Zápotocký organized the revolutionary soviet) to continue his revolutionary work.[1] Instead of a promised socialist revolution, the putsch was followed by arrests and a legal process against the instigators. Thus the timing of Hašek's arrival in Prague was unfortunate. He was not only attacked by the republican press but equally distrusted by the right and the left wing of the Social Democratic Party.[2]

Despite the bitter feelings towards Hašek as a person, he was still appreciated by the public as a writer. During the last three years of his life Hašek created the most important work and his only novel, Švejk, and wrote several dozen articles and short stories. He published his articles in diverse newspapers, including the liberal Tribuna, the Communist Rudé právo, and the pro-government Lidové noviny (People's Newspaper). The clerical press was (as before the war) avoided by Hašek as many of his writings were again directed against the church and its policies (The Pope Ran Away from the Vatican [Papež utekl z Vatikánu], 1921), against the missionaries (About Missionaries [O misionářích], 1922), or against charitable organizations (The Battle with the Salvation Army [Zápas s armádou spásy], 1921). Hašek also followed the tradition of his pre-war work in the articles concerning the secret police (Several Reports of the State Detective Jandák alias Třebízský [Několik raportů státního detektiva Jandáka zn. "Třebízský"], 1921), censor-

ship (The Conversation with a Censor [Rozmluva s cenzorem], 1922), and the politicians with the government officials (The First Meeting of the Minister of Railroads, Father Šrámek, with the Experts [První porada ministra železnic pátera Šrámka s odborníky], 1921).

With special delight he unveiled and described in his articles those aspects of the new society of Czechoslovakia which reminded him of the old empire. Noticing that the war and the rise of the republic did not transform the Czech public to the same degree as the social upheaval in Russia, he successfully ridiculed the still prevailing "imperial" atmosphere of Czechoslovakia. To make his point, Hašek published the article What Editorials I World Write if I Were the Editor of the Official Newspaper (Jaké bych psal úvodníky, kdybych byl redaktorem vládního listu, 1921). The first part of the article was originally published in 1909 and satirized the social and political conditions of Austria-Hungary. Without changing drastically the text, Hašek applied it to the situation in post-war Czechoslovakia.

The articles mentioned above showed that Hašek reverted to his pre-war image of the anti-establishment journalist. His writings were not only thematically similar to those published before the war, but they were just as sharp and highly cirtical. While the critical message of Hašek's articles concerning the society of Czechoslovakia was clear, the same cannot be said about his literary writings relating to his revolutionary past.

The feuilleton Jaroslav Hašek Sings (Jaroslav Hašek zpívá, January 1921) was published by the right-wingers of the Socialist Democratic Party in their journal 28. Říjen (October 28th) in which he was accused of being "a Bolshevik attaché" and his culpability in bloody revolutinoary activities was implied. To this Hašek reacted, without mentioning his Communist past at all, by "confessing" to a multitude of other abhorrent crimes in My Confession (Moje zpověď, January 1921):

> At the age of six months I devoured my oldest brother, stole the holy images of the saints from his coffin and hid them in the maid's bed. As a result the girl was hounded out of the house as a thief and sentenced to ten years' hard labour for robbing a corpse. She died a violent death in gaol in a brawl during her daily exercise. Her fiancé hanged himself, leaving behind six illegitimate children, some of whom achieved prominence later as international hotel crooks. One became a prelate of the Premonstrate order, and the last, the eldest, is a contributor to October 28th.
>
> When I was a year old there was not a single cat in Prague whose eyes I had not gouged out or whose tail I had not docked. When I went for a walk with my governess, all dogs gave me a wide berth.
>
> My governess did not go on taking me out for long because when I was eighteen months old, I took her to the barracks at Charles Square and bartered her away to the soldiers for two packets of tobacco.[3]

The self-mocking tone of this absurd article is surprising because before the war Hašek was always capable of defending himself by successfully ridiculing the attackers in his satire. Moreover, until October 1919 Hašek was a confident Red Army commissar who, according to his Russian wife, returned to Czechoslovakia "to give the Czech bourgeoisie a sound thrashing."[4] Radko Pytlík explains the change in Hašek from an enthusiastic revolutionary journalist into the

author of "confessions" and the paradox in Hašek's writings as the result of the complexity of the historical events and the anti-Soviet atmosphere of the republic:

> At the time of the mass arrests of Communists and former Red Army soldiers, when the preparations for the [Kladno] monstrous high-treason trial were being made, . . . exposed to incitations . . . Hašek creates an original type of mystifying self-ironic mask . . . . The mystification, which was originally only a personal mask, becomes his literary expression. . .[5]

According to Rytlík, this new element of mystifying is present in My Confession as well as in the Bugulma stories, and cultimates in Švejk.[6]

The second "confessional" work, the Bugulma stories, Hašek created shortly after his arrival in Prague. The stories are based on his experiences as a representative of the soviet in the small town of Bugulma in 1918. The first story appeared in the liberal newspaper Tribuna and was followed by eight sequels between January and March 1921.[7]

In The Commandant of the Town of Bugulma (Velitelem města Bugulmy) Hašek depicts his entrance into the town of Bugulma as a representative of the revolutionary soviet. He promises "not to trumpet slogans" but to establish "peace and order," kisses the mayor, shakes the hand of the local priest, and does not require a financial contribution from the population. This peaceful interim is interrupted by the arrival of the Tver Revolutionary Regiment, led by commander Eroximov:

> "Hands up," he said, drunk with victory and pointing a revolver at me. I calmly put up my hands.
> "And who are you?" the Commander of the Tver Regiment asked.

"I am the Commandant of the Town."
"Of the Whites or the Soviet army?"
"The Soviet. May I put my hands down?"
"You can, but I beg you, according to the rules of war, at once to hand over to me the command of the town, because I have conquered Bugulma."
"But I was appointed Commandant," I objected.
"To hell with your being appointed. You've got to conquer it first."
"D'you know what?" he said, magnanimously after a short time. "I appoint you my adjutant. If you don't agree, I'll have you shot in five minutes. . . ."
All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass.[8]

Hašek conveys through Eroximov's usurpation of the official position that one had to expect danger from the supporters of the revolution as well, and the victory in internal disputes was won by force. Soviet critic Elanskij maintains that the Bugulma stories are not anti-Soviet but admits that the problem with commanders abusing their power existed at that time.[9]

Composed, Hašek yields his position to Eroximov but does not discard his responsibility towards the local people and effectively thwarts Eroximov's persecution of poor peasants and "anti-social elements" as it is described in The Adjutant of the Commandant of the Town of Bugulma (Adjutantem velitele města Bugulmy):

"First of all," he answered gravely and solemnly, "I shall order a mobilization of horses. Then I shall have the mayor shot. Then I shall take ten hostages from the bourgeoisie and send them to prison until the end of the civil war. After that I shall carry out a general house-search in the town and prohibit free trading. That'll do for the first day, and tomorrow I'll think up something else."
"Permit me to point out," I said, "that I have nothing at all against mobilization of horses, but I definitely protest against the shooting of the mayor who welcomed me with bread and salt. . . ."
"Further," I said to Eroximov, "I am definitely

> opposed to ten people from the bourgeoisie being sent to prison until the end of the civil war because that can only be decided by the Revolutionary Tribunal. . . ."
>
> "Very well then," Yerokhimov replied with a sigh. "But surely no one can stop us from carrying out a general house-search?"
>
> "According to the decree of the 18th June of this year," I answered, "a general house-search can only be carried out with the consent of the local Revolutionary Committee or Soviet. Since nothing like that exists yet, let's leave the house-search until later."
>
> "You're an angel," said Yerokhimov tenderly. "Without you I would have been sunk. But surely we must stop the free trading?"
>
> "Most of those who carry on trade and go to the bazaars are from the country," I tried to explain. "They are muzhiks who can't read or write. First of all they'll have to learn to be literate, and then they will be able to read our orders and understand what they're about. First we must teach the illiterate population to read and write, see that they understand what we want of them, and then we can issue orders--perhaps even for a mobilization of horses."[10]

Although Hašek tries to demonstrate that the revolution could be carried out peacefully by following a set of regulations which also kept in check the excesses of such individuals as Eroximov, the reality of the Civil War was different. Hašek personally sympathized with the peasants in the story, but their fate was almost unendurable during War Communism because of the constant demands for their products by the Soviet government. Exhausted and on the verge of revolting against the Bolsheviks, their situation improved only when the New Economic Policy was introduced in 1921.

However, Eroximov felt no compassion for the peasantry and solves the problem of illiteracy by an order:

> To the whole population of Bugulma and its Region!
> I order everyone in the whole town and region who cannot read and write to learn to do so within three days. Anyone found to be illiterate after this time will be

shot.[11]

The peasants turn to Hašek for help and he decides to reappoint himself commander, an action he is now capable of because the Petrograd Cavalry Regiment has arrived in Bugulma and Eroximov has had to leave town. Although the change is welcome, the new regiment causes Hašek anxiety because the barracks assigned for the regiment's accommodation are in a deplorable state.

In the third sequel, The Procession of the Cross (Krestný chod), Hašek describes how the problem is solved. Remembering a local convent, "where nuns have nothing else to do but pray and slander one another," he writes to the Abbess asking for "fifty maidens . . . to be at the disposal of the Petrograd Cavalry Regiment." Since the disposal is understood in the worst possible manner (rape), instantly he is confronted by representatives of the Orthodox Church imploring him "not to ruin the innocent convent maidens." Hašek fines them for interfering with official affairs; but when he witnesses the Procession of the Cross, he is impressed and reveals the real reason for demanding the nuns, which was to clean the barracks. The barracks are soon suitable and Hašek receives a little icon from the Abbess with the message "I am praying for you." He ends the story in a most unrevolutionary manner:

> Since that day I sleep in peace, because I know that up to this day, in the old oak forests of Bugulma, there is the Convent of the Most Holy Virgin, where an aged igumen lives and prays for me, wretched good-for-nothing that I am.[12]

Hatred for the clergy usually so prevalent in his writings of the Soviet period is nowhere to be found in the story. In fact, the peaceful collaboration between the church and the Communist power that Hašek represents is the most remarkable feature of The Procession of the Cross. He is explicit in defining his role of a man in charge, including the welfare of the population, but does not overstep his authority in order to suppress people's customs and religious beliefs. Hašek does not present reality untruthfully because he is said to have had the barracks cleaned by nuns who were not harmed by the Red Army soldiers. However, one must realize that Hašek does not present a typical case because the clergy and believers suffered incredibly during the Civil War.

Yet, he again attempts to rectify his image as a bloodstained commissar in Potemkin's Villages (Potěmkinovy vesnice). In this story, Hašek calmly awaits an inspection, despite Eroximov's contention that he cannot prove his capacity as a revolutionary zealot:

> Eroximov gave a meaningful whistle. "He's got nothing to be afraid of! Have you mobilized the horses? No, you have not. Have you got reservists from the local population? No, none at all. Have you levied a contribution on the town? No sign of it. Have you thrown counter-revolutionaries into gaol? Of course not. . . . And now tell me one last thing: have you had at least one priest or member of the merchant class shot? No, you certainly have not. Have you had the former district police officer shot? No, you haven't done that either. And what about the former mayor of the town? Is he alive or dead? Alive. Well, there you are--and you go on telling me you have nothing to be afraid of! It's a bad look out for you, my friend."[13]

In order to solve this predicament and to please the forth-

coming inspection, Eroximov displays false graves of prominent members of Bugulma who were shot as "counter-revolutionaries," meanwhile hiding the mayor, the priest, and the commissary in a pigsty. Observing Eroximov's acts, Hašek rightly points to the similarities between the Potemkin villages of the old and the new Russia.

Judged from the moral point of view, Hašek emerges as a decent human being, but his credibility as an efficient and especially obedient commissar is questionable. If Hašek did not follow all orders blindly, it can be assumed that he was faced with the problem of modern man: the dilemma of personal conscience and the wisdom of the state in whose ideals one believes in. Yet Hašek does not openly disparage the revolution or the Soviet government. When Eroximov wants to shoot a former tsarist colonel in Difficulties with the Prisoners (Nesnáze se zajatci) and questions the Soviet policy on the mobilization of tsarist officers, the commandant of the Petrograd Regiment angrily attacks him for the indiscretions said about the Soviet government. Nevertheless, the colonel is led away by Eroximov to be shot. The colonel hits Hašek as he passes him and escapes on Hašek's horse. This incident is used by Eroximov, who was waiting for an occasion to revenge himself on Hašek. He denounces Hašek for helping the colonel to escape and sends a telegram to Simbirsk to his superiors. This results in the arrival of the Revolutionary Military Soviet.

Hašek's trial is depicted in the last story Before the Revolutionary Tribunal of the Eastern Front (Před revolučním tribunálem východní fronty), and it culminates in his being sentenced to death in efficient Jacobin style--the prosecution is prepared ahead of time in Simbirsk and the testimony of witnesses is not required. However, the case is complicated by Eroximov, who unexpectedly admits that he sent the accusatory message while intoxicated. The roles are reversed and it is now Eroximov whose fate is debated, since drinking was a major offence in the Red Army. Without displaying any human kindness or understanding, the three-member jury turns against Eroximov with macabre zealousness. Agapov, "beautiful in his enthusiasm," proposes death by firing squad, whereas Kalibanova demands twenty years of hard labour and Sorokin calls for military degradation. Because Hašek intervenes, Eroximov is then merely reprimanded and given another chance.[14]

Although the content of the Bugulma stories constitute a part of Hašek's formative Soviet period, they contrast sharply with those writings which are full of revolutionary pathos and which reflect his position in the Soviet hierarchy. The series of Bugulma stories is a unique work because Hašek shows compassion for the people, an element otherwise missing in his acid satirical articles. In Cecil Parrott's view, this "gentle satire" has roots in Hašek's slavophilism.[15] Yet the Bugulma stories are the dream of a pacifist trying to prove his innocence while retaining his

ideals about the revolution. Tragically for Hašek, the two motivations are incompatible. Even the reader with limited imagination and historical knowledge must realize that the irony lies in the fact that the revolution was not won by human decency, compassion for the masses, or non-violent class cooperation. The Russian Civil War was one of the bloodiest civil wars in history, and it is questionable if a commissar of the Red Army could embark on his military career while shaking hands with clergymen, accepting an icon from a nun, or by disobeying orders to shoot innocent people only because he preferred it that way.[16]

However, Elanskij is correct in stating that the Bugulma stories are not anti-Soviet. By avoiding direct criticism Hašek appears not to be against the new rėgime, but he reveals many negative factors previously attributed to the bourgeois morale: the lust for power, the misuse of authority, cowardice, the lack of compassion and respect for ordinary people, and the immorality brought on by personal ambition. Since Hášek does not deal with the enemies of the revolution but its supporters, his criticism is, after all, turned against the erring members of the new society, e.g., the Soviet system. The anomaly lies in the fact that Eroximov's behaviour is the norm while Hašek's conduct is abnormal. Because the conflict is reduced to the level of in-fighting between the good defenders of the revolution and the usurpers, Hašek's main effort is concentrated on proving that he belonged to the category of good and responsible

commissars.

The unrealistic portrayal of the revolution was the root of misunderstanding between Hašek and the Czech literary left. The proletarian writers did not want stories with mystifying elements but a straight-forward laudatory work about the revolution. The Communist writer Stanislav K. Neumann attacked Hašek for being "a traitor of the revolution."[17] Yet what Neumann expected from Hašek was in essence an even more unrealistic description of the revolutionary times, and evidently Hašek was not willing to create such literary work. Instead he began to work on his last "confession," Švejk.

Despite the fact that Hašek promised on several occasions to write about Švejk in Russia and envisaged the titles as Švejk with the Bolsheviks and Švejk in Holy Russia, he never used Russian or Soviet themes again as a literary artist (he did as a journalist though). His novel is an anti-war satire on the First World War and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. After creating four volumes of the book, Hašek had yet to describe Švejk's experiences in Russia, since the first title read The Fortunes of the Good Soldier Švejk in the World and the Civil War. Here and in Russia. It seems significant that Hašek created a novel in which Soviet Russia played no important part, notwithstanding the fact that the Soviet Union represented the first socialist country in the world and was for several years the center of attention. There were many Czech, West European,

and American artists who visited revolutionary Russia and wrote about their experiences, sometimes with criticism but mostly with pathos and enthusiasm. Considering the fact that Hašek was an artist who took an active part in the revolution, it seems even more surprising that he gave preference to the ancient regime over the new and more interesting one.

Hašek's choice of his hero is also striking--instead of a revolutionary, Hašek created Švejk as the most unrevolutionary petty bourgeois pacifist.[18] Hašek cannot be judged as a revolutionary writer because his selection of the place and the hero is, from an ideological point of view, disappointing. It seems that Hašek had his own reasons for creating a different novel from what could be expected from a convinced Bolshevik.

Hašek's own proclamation that "one could be free in this world only as an idiot,"[19] and Švejk's opinion of injustice, confirm that his mind was preoccupied with something other than propagating the revolution:

> "Jesus Christ was innocent too," said Švejk, "but all the same they crucified him. No one anywhere has ever worried about a man being innocent. Maul halten und weiter dienen!--as they used to tell us in the army. That's the best and finest thing of all."[20]

Apparently Hašek tried to prove his innocence (as he did in the Bugulma stories) and was more concerned about it than in his revolutionary work which he was supposed to continue after his arrival in Prague. Hašek's Švejk turned out to be a real literary achievement and not a work of revolution-

ary propaganda. It seems that as a literary artist Hašek did not remain a revolutionary writer but rebelled against the notion of what was expected from him as a former Red Army commissar.

However, Hašek-the literary artist differs from Hašek-the journalist. Although his articles published in various newspapers remind one of the pre-war bohemian journalist, Hašek's feuilletons which appeared in Rudé právo reveal similar traits with some of his Soviet propaganda writings. Hašek's collaboration with the Communist press began in March 1921 after the appearance of the Bugulma stories, although a close working relationship between the editors of Rudé právo and the former Soviet functionary would have been logically expected from December 1920.

Altogether Hašek published thirteen articles in Rudé právo during the post-war period (eight pieces in 1921 and five in 1922).[21] There are examples of his literary contributions to the Communist press. In the article What I Would Advise the Communists If I Were Editor-in-Chief of the Official Newspaper Czechoslovak Republic (Co bych radil komunistům, kdybych byl šéfredaktorem vládního orgánu Československá republika, May 1921) Hašek pokes fun at the editors of the government newspaper, Svátek and Filip, who were previously editors of the imperial official newspaper. For the occasion of the emperor's jubilee Filip even wrote a eulogy. Hašek then asks the Communists to read the official newspaper assiduously and advises the workers to be

kind to their fellow capitalists and rise to a higher moral level by refusing to envy them. In the sarcastic ending he describes the Sunday menu of a government minister, which he hopes will find its way into the homes of the poorest working families: "Beef with Madeira lined with vegetables . . . Deer with Viennese dumplings . . . Lemon pastry stuffed with cranberries . . . Crème Kramář . . . Tort Beneš."[22]

As always, Hašek was capable of detecting contemporary problems and satirizing them. The material differences between the governing bourgeoisie and the working class were noticeable, as in many European countries, and Hašek was correct to criticize them. However, if he was trying to stir hatred and envy among workers, he miscalculated. Czechoslovakia was not a perfect state, but the people were not dissatisfied. The workers saw social and economic amelioration all around them: unemployment and medical insurance, an eight-hour working day, improved laws for tenants, land reform, improvements in the education system, and monetary reform that helped to stabilize the Czech economy after the war. The workers were confident that the government would look after their interests, and the changes which took place after October 1918 confirmed their expectations.

Yet Hašek does not mention any of the positive changes, and what is even more surprising is that he does not make any comparison with the position of the Soviet workers, their achievements and role in the new economic system which was to be known as the first proletarian state.

In another article The Idyll from a Wineshop (Idyla z vinárny, April 1921) Hašek satirizes the anti-Soviet hysteria connected with the Kladno trial. The four main characters (all members of the well-to-do bourgeoisie) meet every day in a restaurant in order to discuss the Bolshevik atrocities in Russia as they enjoy a few drinks. While the Kladno trial was going on, it also became one of their favorite subjects for discussion. The men expect with certainty death sentences for all the accused. The mildness of the verdict surprises them and they are disappointed because they will not be present at "the greatest hanging in the Czech lands."

The Idyll from a Wineshop demonstrates that Hašek did not avoid writing about the Soviet Union or controversial political events such as the Kladno trial. However, Hašek's treatment of the subject is very superficial. He rebuked the Czech public for its anti-Soviet hysteria but did not offer any explanation so that the public would feel differently. Similarly, concerning the Kladno trial, he did not praise the judge for the lenient punishment, although he should have been deeply involved in the affair if it is true that he was sent to Czechoslovakia to help the Kladno Communists. Despite the fact that this was Hašek's chance to defend the lost cause of the Kladno revolutionary soviet or elaborate on the possibility of the Communist future of Czechoslovakia, he did not mention either of them. It seems that although Hašek included the Soviet theme in his writ-

ings, they did not contain a revolutionary message.

In another articles Notes (Poznámky, May 1921) Hašek feels exasperated by the behaviour of some journalists who misuse their profession in order to distort the truth or to supply false facts. He attacks especially the editor of Právo lidu (People's Right), Stivín, who was delighted to see during the May Day celebrations that the supporters of social democracy were more numerous than the adherents of Communism. However, Hašek considers Stivín to be an unreliable witness because the numbers quoted by Stivín were distorted. After making fun of Stivín's calculations, Hašek advises him how to improve the level of the exaggerated reports by perverting the facts even more when writing about the Czech Communists:

> If I were in Stivín's place, I would write that several special trains arrived from Moscow in Prague with the Russian Communists who came in order to salvage the Czech Left from disgrace. The May Day demonstration and the festivities were paid for by Lenin and Trotsky from their own pockets--from the money stolen from the Mensheviks.[23]

Although Hašek uses the distorted facts in order to impress the reader by the preposterousness of the text, in essence the exaggerations proved to be true. There were no special trains arriving in Prague, but there was a sufficient number of Moscow-trained Czech Communists (who were at the same time Soviet citizens) sent to Czechoslovakia in order to put into motion the prepared putsch. They considered the home-based Communists weak, ineffectual, and indecisive (namely, the Šmeral's circle). Muna left Moscow several months

before Hašek, and Hašek himself was sent to Kladno as an experienced political commissar. With regards to the financial support of the Czech Communists it can be assumed that the Soviet government continued to provide its financial aid even after the Czech leftists were repatriated.[24] It is certain that the Czechoslovak government did not subsidize the Communist movement, and the Social Democratic Party (of which the Communists were still a part) needed money for its own May Day enterprise in order to prove that the majority of its members was against the leftists.

The article shows Hašek as a journalist accusing others of unprofessional behaviour while being guilty of the same vice. Hašek's use of incredible exaggerations (based on valid facts) can be seen in some other articles published in Rudé právo. In addition to a tendency to the false presentation of the facts, Hašek seems to prefer to laugh at the mistakes of others, while avoiding any serious discussion so as not to be forced into stating his opinion.

The two aspects of Hašek's writings in the Communist press can be detected also in his political commentary about the Kronstadt uprising. Kronstadt (March 1921) is Hašek's only article in which he deals directly with the political events in Soviet Russia. He laughs at the Czech newspapers and the anti-Soviet radio station in Finland for the way they handled the news about the Kronstadt rebellion. He ridicules Národní listy because of its statement that the Chinese were involved in the attack on Kronstadt. Then he

mocks the absurd telegrams from the radio station in Helsingfors because only one, stating that Kronstadt had fallen, was actually true. Another telegram from Helsingfors stated that the insurgents had blown up the ships and were fleeing to Finland across the ice. Hašek comments that this is also a fine story. Then he continues to criticize political commentaries of other newspapers. The conclusion of Právo lidu that, by attacking Kronstadt, Soviet politics turned to the right is commented on by Hašek sarcastically: "It is a new political theory. If somebody wants to become a rightist, it is necessary that he storm Kronstadt as a Bolshevik."[25] Masaryk's journal Čas (Time), which considered the Bolshevik action a Pyrrhic victory, also amuses Hašek. He wonders why Čas was so astonished that the Bolshevik government had declared its willingness to avoid bloodshed but in fact had taken the fortress by force, and he jeers at the naïveté of the editor who seemed to think that storming Kronstadt could have been done merely by writing articles.

Kronstadt demonstrates that Hašek used the mistakes of others to trip them up, but his own comments are not above criticism as to their factual content. They also reveal that Hašek followed the official Soviet version about the anti-Bolshevik uprising supported by the counter-revolutionary forces, the Mensheviks and the Whites, and heroically suppressed by the Red Army. The statement about the Chinese was not without foundation. Trotsky did indeed call up foreigners, including the Chinese, to cruelly liquidate the

rebellion, because he was afraid that the Russians would refuse to shoot the sailors. The information from Helsingfors about the ships being blown up and the refugees fleeing to Finland across the ice was also correct. "The political theory" also had substance. By suppressing the popular uprising, the Bolsheviks stopped being revolutionaries because they no longer defended the interests of the Russian people. They fought not an enemy of the revolution but its ardent supporters, who only demanded that the earlier promises of the Bolsheviks concerning the inviolability of the soviets be kept. In revolutionary terms, by storming Kronstadt the Bolsheviks became reactionaries.[26]

Although Kronstadt is a feuilleton in which Hašek makes comments about other journalists' comments concerning the events in Soviet Russia, he himself does not discuss the subject of Kronstadt uprising. Yet, as a journalist Hašek knew that the Czech public was always interested in Russia, and he must have been aware of the fact that to receive objective news from the Soviet Union was extremely difficult. This was the main reason why many Czech journalists and politicians would attempt to analyze the events on their own, and although they acted in good faith, later investigation often proved them incorrect.

Hašek, who left Russia only several months before the Kronstadt rebellion, could elucidate the situation better than anyone else, but he chose to laugh at those who tried to draw conclusions rather than to clarify the events himself.

Yet his comments showed that by following the official Soviet version his article on Kronstadt also became a questionable piece of journalism. It is inconceivable that Hašek would not have known the facts and would completely believe the Soviet version. If he did, then he was either afraid or unable to contradict the Communist policies.

Such people, who could closely observe life in Russia after the October Revolution yet continued to follow the official interpretations of the Soviet government, are described by the well-known Russian-American anarchist, Emma Golman, as "the travelling salesmen of the revolution."[27] In contrast to Hašek, after living in the Soviet Union during the years 1919 and 1921, she openly expressed her despair over the fate of the Russian people in the hands of the Bolshevik government. However, Emma Goldman had deep anarchist convictions and fought for a different idea of the revolution and socialism, which was not Hašek's case. His position in Czechoslovakia was certainly very difficult and he had not other choice than to remain with the radical left. After his desertion from the Legion, and after working for the Soviet government, his association with Czech nationalists or conservatives of any kind was unthinkable. Yet, although Hašek's collaboration with the Communist press is undeniable, his literary contributions to Rudé právo do not constitute a majority of his writings at that period, nor are they the most important.

However, it would be out of Hašek's character if his

association with the Communists was considered simple and clear-cut. In the above-mentioned article What I Would Advise the Communists Hašek ridicules the nationalist editors of Československá republika, but when he pretends to be in the position of a patronizing government official giving an advice to the Communists on how to behave during the May 1 demonstration, the text cannot be judged as a straightforward satire:

> First of all we would not wish that the Communists should occupy themselves with politics and the solution of social problems.
>
> It would be nice, if, instead of holding meetings, they would play in a sand box, romp about our numerous parks, and instead of lecturing about the Third International, would play amusing round games.[28]

The article seems to be a satire of the government officials; but taking into account Hašek's low opinion of Czech Communists (Muna was never Hašek's friend) and his talent to create double-edged satire, the excerpt can also be interpreted as his personal view of Communists. Hašek's friend, František Sauer, claims that Hašek held the Czech Communists in disdain because of the way they organized the so-called revolution in 1920 and for which, in Hašek's opinion, Lenin would have put them all into prison on the grounds of stupidity.[29]

Hašek's articles published in the Communist press differ sharply from his publications for other newspapers and from the rest of his literary writings (the Bugulma stories). Although they demonstrate the same boldness noticeable in his pre-war work, they also show discrepancies characteristic

of his articles of the Soviet period. Another aspect of his writings for Rudé právo is the complete absence of a revolutionary message in comparison with his articles for the Soviet press, where Hašek's revolutionary ideas were clearly indicated in the text. A political commissar of Hašek's standing should have been able to discuss the political issues openly, without fear, and defend his position more forcefully. Notwithstanding the fact that Hašek's articles are pro-Soviet and show pro-Communist sympathies, they lack at the same time well-defined statements which would unambiguously clarify Hašek's own opinions as to his political stance.

At a time when the Czech Communists needed all the help they could get, Hašek, with all his previous Red Army experience, seemed to write ideologically indifferent articles. He did not try to advance the revolution in Czechoslovakia by propagating the revolutionary ideals in his articles and what is even more incongruous is the fact that he did not use the opportunity to advocate the advantages of the Soviet socialist system over capitalist Czechoslovakia. It is true that he followed the official Soviet interpretation of the Kronstadt rebellion, hiding behind the political commentaries of other journalists, but there is no way of knowing what Hašek really thought because he did not discuss the issue in his article openly.

In order to establish if Hašek was a rebel or a revolutionary during his last literary period, he has to be judged from three different angles--as a reverted bohemian

journalist, as a literary artist, and as a contributor to the Communist press. Following his return to Czechoslovakia, Hašek reverted to his pre-war bohemian image and his articles published in the Czech newspapers (except Rudé právo) resemble his feuilletons of the pre-war era. The only apparent change was that Hašek concentrated on the society of Czechoslovakia instead of the society of Austria-Hungary.

Although Hašek's transformation into a bohemian seemed very natural to the public, the change from a revolutionary journalist of the Red Army into the writer of confessions is difficult to comprehend. Hašek tried to defend himself against the accusations of taking part in the Civil War atrocities in My Confession. The most evident attempt to shed the image of a blood-stained commissar can be seen in the Bugulma stories where Hašek presented himself as a remarkably decent commissar who saved human lives, although at the end it proved to be his undoing.

The reason why Hašek felt compelled to write the self-ironic confessions can only be contemplated. Radko Pytlík, who rightly realizes the importance of the Bugulma stories in Hašek's literary development culminating in Švejk, suggests that Hašek's self-ironic mystification was the result of the animosity of the Czech bourgeois society and the anti-Soviet atmosphere of the republic. However, Pytlík's point of view does not satisfactorily explain why Hašek would feel the need to change his literary expression.

The frequent recipient of Hašek's satire before the

war, the Czech bourgeoisie was no different when Hašek returned to Czechoslovakia and therefore would not surprise him to such a degree that he would introduce new elements into his writings. Hašek's social satire of the post-war period reflects well what he felt about the society of Czechoslovakia. What is, however, more surprising is that Hašek, as an experienced Bolshevik who had fought the bourgeoisie in Russia during the Civil War and had written fierce articles against that class, did not continue these activities in Czechoslovakia. Instead, he moved out of Prague and found refuge in Lipnice where his last and most important "confession," Švejk, was written, while he drank himself gradually to death.

The Czech bourgeoisie can be held responsible for not fully appreciating Hašek's talent but not for his personal unhappiness. His confessional writings are all related to the war years, which means to the past, not to the present. It seems that Hašek's bitterness had its roots in his Soviet past rather than in his new life in Czechoslovakia, which the Czech bourgeoisie exemplified. Because Hašek never cared about public opinion before, this is the reason why his attempt to clear his name before the (bourgeois) public is incongruous. It can be assumed that the real reason behind his confessional writings can be attributed either to his feeling of guilt (one does not need to confess otherwise) or to his feeling of injustice (one does not have to defend and justify one's actions otherwise),

rather than to the existence of the Czech bourgeoisie.

The Czech bourgeoisie is also criticized by Pytlík for its sensationalist interest in Hašek's Soviet past and for its rejection of Hašek's "historical scepticism" of the Bugulma stories.[30] Yet the truth is that Hašek's Bugulma stories were well received by the public but his historical scepticism was rejected by the Czech literary left expecting an exemplary revolutionary work. If Hašek was considered a traitor of the revolution because the Bugulma stories describe the revolution unrealistically, it can be well imagined how Hašek would be attacked if he wrote with criticism instead of scepticism.

The Bugulma stories prove that Hašek, after faithfully serving the Soviet regime as a revolutionary journalist, and following the party line without deviation in his articles, regained the use of his artistic freedom in Czechoslovakia and created a literary work on his own terms. The same can be said abut Švejk, a novel without a revolutionary hero and a revolutionary locale. If Hašek's life experience in Soviet Russia had been a positive one, he would certainly have used it as a subject in his most important work. In this sense, Neumann's anger against Hašek is understandable. From his Communist point of view, Hašek was a traitor because he could not be controlled any longer as a literary artist. Yet Hašek did not betray the revolution, only the unrealistical ideological claims on his literary talent.

Hašek's collaboration with the Communist press seems

to be also controversial. Despite the fact that Hašek's writings are not anti-Soviet or anti-Communist on the surface, it is probable that he was not trusted completely, because the cooperation reveals some serious inconsistencies which should not have appeared if Hašek had been accepted by the Czech Communists without any reservation. The working relationship between Hašek and Rudé právo began only after the publication of the Bugulma stories in March 1921, which caused such a stir among the leftist writers. Although Hašek was in an unenviable financial situation, he was not offered a job as editor of Rudé právo, which indicates that he either did not seek such employment or was not trusted at the beginning. In Pytlík's opinion, there is a connection between Hašek's conception of Švejk and his collaboration with the Communist press:

> Hašek realized gradually, and it is connected to his Communist orientation in spring 1921, that Švejk, who is supposed to represent the spokesman of the self-ironic mask, cannot be limited only to the "Soviet" fortunes which were evoked by the sensationalist public, but that he must go as far as the pre-war era and the Sarajevo assassination in order to analyze the relationship of a Czech man towards the war and the epoch-making events.[31]

It can be only speculated upon if Hašek was put under the pressure by the Czech Communists not to write disparagingly about the Soviet Union or if it was his own choice not to use his revolutionary past as a subject for his stories and not to let Švejk go through Hašek's Soviet experience in the novel. There is also a possibility, which has to be considered, that Hašek was blackmailed into cooperation

with the Communist press in order to keep his Red Army commissar image untarnished and his literary writings under control as much as possible. Hašek's articles for Rudé právo prove that he conformed to the official party line (Kronstadt) but was not subdued completely.

Although Hašek's feuilletons published in the Communist press are considered by the Marxist critics as a definite proof of his ideological stand and the fidelity to the ideals of revolution, this claim is only partially true.[32] The examples presented here demonstrate that Hašek successfully used negative features of the Czech society in order to ridicule them but that he did not use the Communist media to advance the revolution or to propagate the newly-established socialist regime. For this reason it seems that, judging on the whole, it is more important to emphasize not what Hašek wrote about but about what he did not.

The small number of articles in Rudé právo and its contents are not convincing enough to assume that Hašek was a revolutionary. The fact that Hašek did not share as a writer his Soviet experiences with his readers after the appearance of the Bugulma stories can mean the following: that it was either demanded from him by the Czech Communists or it may be that Hašek became a rebel again by not writing enthusiastically about the revolution and the Soviet Union. In the article What I Would Advise the Communists, he proved that he was able to voice his opinion in the double-edged satire, because that was what he knew best. His

Communist affiliation may be debatable but his status as an excellent satirist could not.

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 338. It is interesting to note that Hašek was directed to take up the work in Kladno where Alois Muna acted as one of the leaders, although their collaboration in Kiev and Moscow proved to be disastrous for Hašek. Muna tried also to ruin Hašek's career in Siberia but did not succeed.

[2]Ibid, pp. 336, 339. The accusations of the right nationalist press, such as 28. Říjen, are understandable, because Hašek's desertion from the Legion was considered an act of treason against the Czech nation. However, Hašek's alleged difficulties with the Social Democratic left are not convincingly explained by Marxist scholars. Radko Pytlík does not clarify why or by whom Hašek was considered a provocateur. The left-wingers and future Communists, Šmeral and Olbracht, were in Russia in 1920 and demanded the repatriation of the Czech Bolsheviks, including Hašek. Šmeral was also, according to Pytlík, the first official to learn about Hašek's revolutionary work in Siberia. Yet Pytlík maintains in the same text that the Social Democratic left "shut the door to Hašek," without giving any particular names (Pytlík, Toulavé house, pp. 332, 339). Vostokova also affirms that Hašek was not trusted by the leftists and that under such circumstances he found it impossible to remain a member of the party (Vostokova, Gašek, pp. 119-21). Zdena Ančík names specifically two party officials, Jílek and Bolen, who refused to give Hašek any work, considering him unreliable. They were later expelled from the party as traitors (Zdena Ančík, "Doslov," an Afterword to Jaroslav Hašek's Satiry a humoresky [Prague: 1955], p. 283). It is clear that Hašek was caught up again in the in-fighting of the numerous factions of the Social Democratic Party before its split into the Communist branch. Jílek and Bolen might have considered Hašek a provocateur if the version of Hašek's retreat from Siberia was well founded, and they would not have been alone in their assessment of Hašek as an unreliable party member.

[3]Parrott, Bad Bohemian, p. 28. Trans. Cecil Parrott.

[4]Ibid, p. 220.

[5]Radko Pytlík, "Ediční poznámky a vysvětlivky," Notes to Moje zpověď by Jaroslav Hašek, Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 16, ed. Zdena Ančík et al. (Prague: 1968), p. 340.

[6]Ibid., p. 341.

[7]The series, published under the subtitle From the Secret of My Sojourn in Russia, include the stories: The Commandant of the Town of Bugulma, The Adjutant of the Commandant of the Town of Bugulma, The Procession of the Cross, In Strategic Difficulties, The Glorious Days of Bugulma, New Dangers, Potemkin's Villages, Difficulties with the Prisoners, and Before the Revolutionary Tribunal of the Eastern Front.

[8]Hašek, Red Commissar, p. 7.

[9]Elanskij, Gašek v. Rossii, p. 138.

[10]Hašek, Red Commissar, pp. 9-10.

[11]Ibid, p. 11.

[12]Ibid, p. 18.

[13]Ibid, p. 36.

[14]Actually, when Hašek was a commissar, he denounced a drunken colleague and criticized him in one of his articles for the Red Army newspaper with the same intolerance exhibited by the members of the tribunal. (Parrott, Bad Bohemian, p. 203).

[15]Parrott, Study, p. 69.

[16]Roland Gaucher, Opposition in the U.S.S.R.: 1917-1967, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1969), p. 24. Roland Gaucher writes about the Civil War:

> "As the time went on, the Red Army became stronger, more cohesive, better disciplined. As far as atrocities were concerned, however, it equaled if it did not outstrip the Whites. The battles were without quarter, and their toll was inflicted not so much by the fighting, which as a rule was brief enough, as by what followed. Massacres of prisoners, reprisal actions, raids by various guerrilla bands, burning of villages, hangings and shootings of suspects, epidemics, famines . . . the combined toll of all these scourges amounted to seven million deaths."

[17]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 347.

[18]Parrott, Study, p. 174. Although Švejk as an anti-war work was very popular among the leftist artists, any attempt to present his hero as a political figure proved to be futile. Bertolt Brecht, Erwin Piscator, and E.F. Burian

tried unsuccessfully to make a revolutionary out of Švejk. From an ideological point of view, Hašek's book was from the very beginning a controversial literary work.

[19]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 343.

[20]Hašek, Švejk, p. 19.

[21]Radko Pytlík and Miroslav Laiske, Bibliografie Jaroslava Haška: Soupis jeho díla a literatury a něm (Prague: 1960), pp. 144-53.

[22]Hašek, Moje zpověď, p. 145.

[23]Ibid, p. 131.

[24]Hašek was also helped financially in order to continue his revolutionary work in Czechoslovakia. Besides being given enough material for propaganda work, he received a sum of German marks; according to one source it was fifteen hundred marks, according to another source, he received twice as much.

[25]Hašek, Moje zpověď, p. 60.

[26]Paul Avrich, Kronstadt 1921 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), pp. 193, 209, 223, 225.

[27]Emma Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, with Introduction by Rebecca West and a Bibliographical Sketch by Frank Harris (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Apollo Edition, 1970), pp. 213-14.

[28]Hašek, Moje zpověď, p. 143.

[29]Sauer and Suk, In memoriam, pp. 89-90.

[30]Pytlík, Toulavé house, p. 347.

[31]Pytlík, "Ediční poznámky," pp. 341-42.

[32]Elanskij, Gašek, p. 44; Křížek, Hašek v Rusku, p. 312.

## CONCLUSION

From the available critical sources and Hašek's writings it can be concluded that Hašek was a rebel, not a revolutionary, before World War I. He did not create a revolutionary aesthetic ideal and he did not propagate systematically the working class throughout this period of his life. Hašek's involvement in anarchism proved to be an important but short-lived experience which was reflected in a few proletarian articles with naive revolutionary messages and a low literary quality.

Hašek was an anti-social rebel who criticized severely the society of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and attacked in his satire all authority of the establishment, be it secular or religious. His rejection of the political life of the monarchy was due to his nihilist attitude and political immaturity rather than due to a serious search on his part for new solutions to the contemporary problems. Hašek joined and subsequently left the anarchists, the National Socialists, and the Social Democrats only to satirize his experiences in his work. These experiences resulted in Hašek's pre-war political cynicism.

Although Hašek criticized in his satire all strata of Austro-Hungarian society, he did sympathize with the rural and urban poor, and with the criminals. However, his interest

did not go beyond his literary writings. Thus, by creating the folk rogue, Hašek's contribution to pre-war society is that of a literary artist not of a political activist.

The war years and Hašek's sojourn in Russia caused a serious change in his personality and his writings: from a political cynic he turned into a political activist. At first Hašek became a revolutionary nationalist who supported the Czech independence movement and helped to organize the Legion. The political changes which took place in Russia were the reason why the relationship between Hašek and the leadership of the Legion deteriorated. Rebelling against its policies, Hašek reacted in the same manner as before the war--by writing satirical articles on the subject and then leaving the organization.

During the Kiev period Hašek primarily wrote articles for the nationalist cause, but he also created several short stories and the anti-Habsburg satire, Švejk in Captivity, which proves that he did not cease completely to be a literary artist.

However, the October Revolution impressed Hašek to such a degree that he was converted into a Marxist revolutionary who supported the Soviet government throughout the Civil War. During the Siberian period Hašek was not only a revolutionary journalist but also an important functionary of the Red Army. Propaganda articles and political commentaries constitute the majority of his writings which means that Hašek's creativity suffered even more than during his

legionary period. The Soviet and Czech editions of Hašek's works show no writings of critical satire or a major literary work of any importance. All of Hašek's revolutionary articles contain a political message but his writings never reached the literary quality of his pre-war work. Thus Hašek's contribution in both instances--during his Kiev and Soviet periods--is mainly political.

However, the sources which state that Hašek wrote Švejk in the Bolshevik Country and that he ran away from Siberia indicate that Hašek turned back into the rebel by falling back on two means which he knew how to use best--satire and flight. Moreoever, this notion would be consistent with Hašek's lifestyle and character. Even if Hašek did not create any work of satirical criticism in Soviet Russia while being there, the Bugulma stories supply the missing link that demonstrates that Hašek was unable not to satirize his Soviet experiences because he could not suppress his satirical talent indefinitely.

Hašek's pro-establishment attitude of the war years changed drastically after his return to Czechoslovakia as Hašek reverted back into the anti-establishment bohemian writer with politically ambiguous opinions. Although the official Soviet and Czech sources interpret Hašek's post-war life and work as that of a Communist, a careful examination of Hašek's writings reveals contradictions which do not support such a conclusion. The absence of laudatory

"revolutionary" themes from contemporary Soviet Russia, the bourgeois character of his most famous hero Švejk, and the unrealistic yet satirical depiction of the Civil War in the Bugulma stories indicate a definite problem in relation to the official image of Hašek as a Communist, in spite of the fact that he contributed to the Communist press at the same time.

If by writing the Bugulma stories Hašek tried to rebel against what was expected from him as a former Red Army commissar, his rebellion still remains enigmatic. He never made a clear statement about his Soviet past as openly as another anarchist, Emma Goldman. However, Hašek's silence can be interpreted as a rebellion, while his articles published in Rudé právo do not prove that he remained a revolutionary, only that he followed the official line of the Soviet government. Yet his "confessional" writings (Švejk and the Bugulma stories), which do not contain any political message, prove that Hašek became a literary artist on his own terms. It seems that his rebel image and literary output were closely interconnected: it was only as a rebel that he was able to contribute as a literary artist.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES


Gašek, Jaroslav. Sočinenija Jaroslava Gaška v pjati tomax. Vol. 5: Rasskazy, stat'i i fel'etony. Edited by P. Bogatyrev. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," 1966.

Hašek, Jaroslav. Črty, povídky a humoresky z cest. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 1. Edited by Zdena Ančík and František Daneš. Prague: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1955.

_____. Dobrý voják Švejk v zajetí: Stati a humoresky z dob války. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vols. 13-14. Edited by Zdena Ančík, Milan Jankovič and Radko Pytlík. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1973.

_____. Galerie karikatur. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 8. Edited by Milan Jankovič and Radko Pytlík. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1964.

_____. The Good Soldier Švejk and His Fortunes in the World War. Translated, with Preface by Cecil Parrott. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1973.

_____. Lidožroutská historie: Druhý dekameron. Výbor z díla Jaroslava Haška, vol. 3. Edited by Radko Pytlík. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1979.

_____. Loupežný vrah před soudem. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 2. Edited by Zdena Ančík and Radko Pytlík. Prague: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1958.

_____. Moje zpověď. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 16. Edited by Zdena Ančík, Milada Chlíbcová, Milan Jankovič and Radko Pytlík. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1968.

_____. Politické a sociální dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 9. Edited by Zdena Ančík, Radko Pytlík and Milan Jankovič. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1963.

_____. Procházka přes hranice: První dekameron. Výbor z díla Jaroslava Haška, vol. 2. Edited by Milan Jankovič and Radko Pytlík. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1976.

_____. The Red Commissar: Including Further Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk and Other Stories. Edited, translated, with Preface by Cecil Parrott. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1981.

_____. Velitelem města Bugulmy: Z tajemství mého pobytu v Rusku. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 15. Edited by Zdena Ančík, Milan Jankovič, Radko Pytlík and Břetislav Storek. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1966.

_____. Zrádce národa v Chotěboři. Spisy Jaroslava Haška, vol. 4. Edited by Zdena Ančík, Milada Chlíbcová, Milan Jankovič and Radko Pytlík. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1962.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

Ančík, Zdena. "Nová podobizna Jaroslava Haška." Foreword to Malá zoologická zahrada by Jaroslav Hašek. Edited by Zdena Ančík. Prague: Práce, 1950, 5-9.

Beneš, Jan. "Netrpělivý člověk pravoslavný." Foreword to Velitelem města Bugulmy by Jaroslav Hašek. Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers, 1976, 7-27.

Bernštejn, I.A. Češskij roman XX veka i puti realizma v evropejskix literaturax. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1979.

Elanskij, N.P. Jaroslav Gašek. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Prosveščenie," 1980.

_____. Jaroslav Gašek v revoljucionnoj Rossii. Moscow: Izadatel'stvo social'no-ėkonomičeskoj literatury, 1960.

Frynta, Emanuel. Hašek the Creator of Schweik. Translated by Jean Layton and George Theiner. Prague: Artia, 1965.

Křížek, Jaroslav. Jaroslav Hašek v revolučním Rusku. Prague: Naše vojsko, 1957.

Langer, František. Byli a bylo. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1963.

Parrott, Cecil. The Bad Bohemian: The Life of Jaroslav Hašek Creator of the Good Soldier Švejk. London: Bodley Head, 1978.

_____. Jaroslav Hašek: A Study of Švejk and the Short Stories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Pynsent, Robert, ed. Czech Prose and Verse. Introduction by Robert Pynsent. London: Athlone Press, 1979.

Pynsent, Robert. "The Last Days of Austria: Hašek and Kraus." The First War in Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays. Holger Klein, ed. London: MacMillan Press, 1976, 138-148.

Pytlík, Radko. "Doslov." Afterword to Politické a sociální dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona by Jaroslav Hašek, 280-85.

_____. "Ediční poznámky a vysvětlivky." Notes to Zrádce národa v Chotěboři by Jaroslav Hašek, 379-80.

_____. "Ediční poznámky a vysvětlivky." Notes to Moje zpověď by Jaroslav Hašek, 339-42.

_____. "Hašek literární a neliterární." Nový život 11 (1959), 39-49.

_____. "Lidovost v Haškových povídkách z cest." Česká literatura 7 (1959), 1-16.

Pytlík, Radko., ed. Lidský profil Jaroslava Haška: Korespondence a dokumenty. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1979.

Pytlík, Radko. "Na okraj Haškovy sociální satiry." Afterword to Loupežný vrah před soudem by Jaroslav Hašek, 401-406.

_____. Toulavé house: Zpráva o Jaroslavu Haškovi. Prague: Mladá fronta, 1971.

_____. "Vznik satirického typu v tvorbě Jaroslava Haška." O české satiře: Sborník statí. Edited by František Buriánek. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1959, 259-71.

Pytlík, Radko and Laiske, Miroslav. Bibliografie Jaroslava Haška: Soupis jeho díla o něm. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1960.

Sauer, Franta and Suk, Jiří. In memoriam Jaroslava Haška. Prague: Družstevní nakladatelství, 1924.

Součková, Milada. A Literary Satellite: Czech-Russian Literary Relations. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970.

Šalda, František Xaver. "Dada." Šaldův zápisník 5 Prague: Otto Girgal, 1932-1933, 422-37.

_____. "Jaroslav Durych, essayista." Šaldův zápisník 1 Prague: Otto Girgal, 1928-1929, 10-18.

Škvorecký, Josef. "Some Contemporary Czech Prose Writers." Novel 4 (Fall 1970), 5-13.

Vlach, Robert. "Gogol and Hašek--Two Masters of Poshlost'." Etudes slaves et est-européennes 7 (Automne-Hiver 1962), 239-42.

Vostokova, S. Jaroslav Gašek. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Xudožestvennaja literatura," 1964.

## SUPPLEMENTARY SOURCES

Avrich, Paul. Kronstadt 1921. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Bradley, J.F.N. La Légion Tchécoslovaque en Russie 1914-1920. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1965.

Camus, Albert. The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt. Translated by Anthony Bower. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

Elliot, Robert C. The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Fic, Victor M. Revolutionary War for Independence and the Russian Question: The Czechoslovak Army in Russia 1914-1918. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1977.

_____. The Bolsheviks and the Czechoslovak Legion: The Origin of Their Armed Conflict March-May 1918. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1978.

Gaucher, Roland. Opposition in the U.S.S.R.: 1917-1967. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1969.

Goldman, Emma. My Disillusionment in Russia. Introduction by Rebecca West and Biographical Sketch by Frank Harris. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., Apollo Edition, 1970.

Hermann, A.H. A History of the Czechs. London: Allen Lane, 1975.

Highet, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Satire. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Kalvoda, Josef. Czechoslovakia's Role in Soviet Strategy. Washington: University Press of America, 1978.

Kann, Robert A. A History of the Habsburg Empire: 1526-1918. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Kolkowicz, Roman. The Soviet Military and the Communist Party. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Novák, Arne. Dějiny českého písemnictví. Edited by Antonín Grund. Prague: Bohumil Janda, "Sfinx," 1946.

Seton-Watson, R.W. A History of the Czechs and Slovaks. Hutchinson & Co., 1943. Reprint ed. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965.